THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST W.

FIDE SED CUI VIDE
1897
EX LIBRIS
HUBERT . BEAUMONT .

616940

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

7 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLXXII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM MONDAY, EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL, 1907, TO TUESDAY, TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF APRIL, 1907.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1907.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. ; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal ; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621 ; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols. ; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols. ; Almon's Debates, 24 vols. ; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols. ; The Hardwicke Papers ; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table :—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41 Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42 Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7 Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Will. IV.......1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 Will. IV. 1832
— 9 — 14... 3 — 1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 Will. IV....... 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — 1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 Will. IV....... 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — 1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 to 44... 1 Victoria 1838
— 45 — 50... 2 — 1839
— 51 — 55... 3 — 1840
— 56 — 58... 4 — (a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 59 .... 4 Victoria (b) 1841
— 60 to 65... 5 — 1842
— 66 — 71... 6 — 1843
— 72 — 76... 7 — 1844
— 77 — 82... 8 — 1845
— 83 — 88... 9 — 1846
— 89 — 94...10 — (a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 95 ... .10 Victoria (b) 1847
— 96 to 101...11 — 1848
— 102 —107...12 — 1849
— 108 —113...13 — 1850
— 114 —118...14 — 1851
— 119 —122...15 — (a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 123 ....15 Victoria (b) 1852
— 124 to 129...16 — 1853
— 130 —135...17 — 1854
— 136 —139...18 — 1855
— 140 —143...19 — 1856
— 144 — ....20 — (a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol. 145 to 147...20 Victoria (b) 1857
— 148 —151...21 — 1858
— 152 —153...22 — (a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 154 to 155...22 Victoria (b) 1859
— 156 —160...23 — 1860
— 161 —164...24 — 1861
— 165 —168...25 — 1862
— 169 —172...26 — 1863
— 173 —176...27 — 1864
— 177 —180...28 — 1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 181 to 184...29 Victoria...... 1866
— 185 —189...30 — 1867
— 190 —193...31 — ... 1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol. 194 to 198...32 Victoria ... 1868-9
— 199 —203...33 — 1870
— 204 —208...34 — 1871
— 209 —213...35 — 1872
— 214 —217...36 — 1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol. 218 to 221...37 Victoria 1874
— 222 —226...38 — 1875
— 227 —231...39 — 1876
— 232 —236...40 — 1877
— 237 —242...41 — 1878
— 243 —249...42 — ... 1878-9
— 250 & 251...43 — (a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol. 252 to 256...43 Victoria (b) 1880
— 257 —265...44 — 1881
— 266 —273...45 — (a) 1882
— 274 & 275...45 — (b) 1882
— 276 to 283...46 — 1883
— 284 —292...47 — 1884
— 293 —301...48 — ... 1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol. 302 to 307...49 Victoria (a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 308 & 309...49 Victoria (b) 1886
— 310 to 321...50 — 1887
— 322 —332...51 — 1888
— 333 —340...52 — 1889
— 341 —348...53 — 1890
— 349 —356...54 — ... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	EDWARD VII.	1906
Vol.	169 to 172	7	„ „	1907

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
  Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
  Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
  War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
  India Office——Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. R. McKenna, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Portsmouth.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——Thomas Lough, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. Robertson, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. Kearley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Walter Runciman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
  J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
  Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
  Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
  J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
  Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
  Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
  Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
  General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
  General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray (Master-General of the Ordnance).
  The Under Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General——Sir J. Lawson Walton, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Sir W. S. Robson, M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Lord Steward——
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of Elibank, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir Edward Strachey, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount Althorp.
Vice-Chamberlain——Wentworth Beaumont, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of Sefton.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of Manchester.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl Granville.
- Earl of Granard.
- Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.
- Lord Acton.
- Lord Denman.
- Lord Colebrooke.
- Lord Suffield.

Judge Advocate-General——T. Milvain, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. John Sinclair.
Lord High Constable——Earl of Errol.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of Breadelbane, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of Argyll, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord Kinnaird.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord Dunedin.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. Thomas Shaw, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Solicitor-General——Alexander Ure, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir Stair Agnew, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. Leach, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of Aberdeen, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. Macdonnell, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord Herschell and Walter Callan, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——Viscount Hawkesbury, M.V.O.
Controller——Major Lambart.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice Walker.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R Cherry, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Redmond Barry, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord Grenfell, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; G. D. Luard, Esq.; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stott.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.; S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.
Junior Clerks——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq.; C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; W. P. Johnston, Esq.; J. Barlow, Esq.; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour; R. N. Bailey, Esq.; G. F. M. Campion, Esq.; S. De la Poer Beresford, Esq.; H. S. Green, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE Esq
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq.
Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART : Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr. G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXII.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1907.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, 8TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

Page

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Westmeath (South Westmeath Division), in the room of Donal Sullivan, esquire, deceased.—(*Mr. Patrick O'Brien.*) 1

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Basingstoke Gas Bill; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill.—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1

Maidstone Gas Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramway Bill [LORDS]; Medway Lower Navigation Bill [Lords]; Newquay and District Water Bill [Lords]; Royal Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 1

London United Tramways Bill (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed 2

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 2

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Audlton and Dalserf; Burslem; Carronshore; Cowie; Craighead; Cwmneol; Denny; Dennyloanhead; East Glean; Fforchaman; Hanford; Kilsyth; Kinflats; Larbert; Polmaise; Quarter; and, Redding Collieries; to lie upon the Table 2

Apr. 8.] *Page*

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Arbroath, against; to lie upon the Table 3

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Bannockburn; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Grangemouth (two); Lossiemouth; and Montrose; to lie upon the Table 3

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Reading, against; to lie upon the Table 3

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 3

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.—Petition from Ravenstonedale, in favour; to lie upon the Table 3

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).—The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Easter Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

1. Trade Reports (Annual Series). Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3753 and 3754.

2. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series). Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 657 and 658.

3. Egypt (No. 1, 1907). Copy of Reports by His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General on the Finances, Administration, and Condition of Egypt and the Soudan in 1906.

4. Most-Favoured-Nation Clauses (Commercial, No. 3, 1907). Copy of Return of Most-Favoured-Nation Clauses in existing Treaties of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies, in force on the 1st January, 1907.

5. National Treatment Clauses (Commercial, No. 4, 1907). Copy of Return of National Treatment Clauses in existing Treaties of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies, in force on the 1st January, 1907.

6. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission). Copy of Reports on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster, preserved at Grimsthorpe.

7. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission). Copy of Calender of the Stuart Papers belonging to His Majesty the King preserved at Windsor Castle. Vol. III.

Ordered That the said Papers do lie upon the Table 3

Apr. 8.] Page

ARMY.—Copy presented, of Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War, with Tables showing the War Establishments and Composition of the proposed Field Force and other particulars, under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

ARMY.—Copy presented, of Memorandum showing how various enactments are affected by the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.—Accounts presented, for the year 1906, with an Account of extraordinary Works executed other than the general Repairs for the same period [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 4

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Return of the Areas, Population, and Valuation of Counties, Burghs and Parishes in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

POLICE (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Forty-ninth Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland for the year ended 31st December, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 4

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.—Copy presented, of Report by the Local Government Board for Scotland as to the Proceedings of Distress Committees in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 5

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1906.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland allocating certain sums out of the General Fund of the Board of Manufactures [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 5

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1906.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland with regard to the establishment, powers, etc., of the new Board of Trustees and the purposes for which certain buildings shall be held [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 5

GOVERNMENT INSURANCES AND ANNUITIES.—Account presented, of all Moneys received and of the disposal thereof, and of all Contracts for the grant of Deferred Life Annuities and for Payments on Death made during the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 99.] .. 5

CROWN'S NOMINEE ACCOUNT.—Abstract Account presented, of Receipts and Payments of the Treasury Solicitor, in the year ended 31st December, 1906, in the Administration of Estates on behalf of the Crown, and Alphabetical List of Intestates' Estates in respect of which Letters of Administration were granted to the Treasury Solicitor as Crown's Nominee, and of other cases (partial Intestacies, etc.) in which accounts were opened in the Books of the Treasury Solicitor in the same year in respect of moneys received by him as Crown's Nominee [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 100.] 5

GREEK LOAN OF 1898.—Account presented, up to 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 5

EGYPTIAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1885.—Account presented, up to 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 6

Apr. 8.] *Page*

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).—Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, oustanding at the commencement of the half year ending on the 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 101] 6

REMUNERATION OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS TO CROWN COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES.—Return presented relative thereto [Address 19th December, 1906; *Mr. Walker*]; to lie upon the Table 6

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Irish Land Purchase Fund. Accounts of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Irish Land Purchase Fund in the year ended 31st March, 1906, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 102] 6

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Return ordered, " of all instances in which the Inspectors of the Board of Trade, in their Reports on Railway Accidents inquired into by them since and including the year 1900, have represented that the hours of any of the Railway Servants on duty on the occasion of such accidents have been unduly long, stating the name, date, and nature of such accidents, and the Railway or Railways on which they occurred, and giving, in full, the passages in such Reports relating to such unduly long hours."—(*Sir Francis Channing*) 6

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CITY CORPORATION LUNCHES.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 6

LONDON UNEMPLOYED GRANT.—Question, Sir A. Spicer (Hackney, Central); Answer, Mr. John Burns 7

CONDEMNED TINNED GOODS.—Question, Mr. E. H. Lamb (Rochester); Answer, Mr. John Burns 8

IRISH FINANCIAL RELATIONS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 8

IRISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO IMPERIAL EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 10

SILVER CURRENCY FOR THE WEST INDIES.—Question, Mr. O. C. Philipps (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answer, Mr. Runciman 11

DUBLIN ASSISTANT CLERKS.—Question, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 11

ELECTRIC POWER FOR THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Haddock (Lancashire, North Lonsdale); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 11

COST OF TORPEDO RANGES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 12

INDIAN SECTION, IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley.. 12

Apr. 8.]

Page

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL'S PAY.—Question, Mr. Haddock; Answer, Mr Haldane .. 12

TERRITORIAL FORCE—COST OF UNIFORM.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Haldane 12

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

INDIAN TRADE JOURNAL.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 13

BIMLIPATAM.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 13

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.—Questions, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 14

BRITISH COLOURED SUBJECTS IN THE CONGO.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 15

THE CHANNEL TUNNEL.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Mr. Runciman 15

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE.—Question, Mr. Goddard Clarke (Camberwell, Peckham); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 16

CHURCH ARMY WORKSHOP.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) and Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 17

ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Mr. Runciman 18

SUPPLY [5TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee :—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS I.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £43,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of Royal Palaces."

Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's) 18
Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) 19
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 20
The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 21
Mr. Akers-Douglas 21
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 22
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 22
Mr. Harcourt 23
Mr. Morton 24

Apr. 8.] Page

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Item E be reduced by £3,240." —(*Mr. Lea.*)

Mr. Harcourt 25
Sir F. Banbury 26

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £9,100, to complete the sum for Osborne.

Mr. Morton 26
Sir F. Banbury 26
Sir W. Evans Gordon (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 27
Mr. Lea 27
Mr. Cochrane (*Ayrshire, N.*) 27
Mr. Harcourt 28

Vote agreed to.

3. £50,700, to complete the sum for Diplomatic and Consular buildings.

Sir F. Banbury 30
Sir W. Evans Gordon 30
Mr. Morton 30
Mr. Harcourt 31
Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 32
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 32
Sir F. Banbury 33
Mr. Annan Bryce (*Inverness Burghs*) 34
Sir Gilbert Parker 35
Mr. J. Ward (*Stoke-on-Trent*) 36
Mr. Rees 36
Mr. Harcourt 37
Sir W. Evans Gordon 38
Sir F. Banbury 39
Mr. Morton 39
Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 40
Mr. Fell (*Great Yarmouth*) 41
Mr. Harcourt 41

Vote agreed to.

4. Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the sum, not exceeding £427,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office, and Post Office Telegraph Buildings in Great Britain, and certain Post Offices abroad, including Furniture, Fuel, and sundry Miscellaneous Services."

Sir F. Banbury 42

Whereupon Motion made, and Question put, " That a sum, not exceeding £426,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Apr. 8.] Page

Mr. Harcourt .. 43
Mr. Ashley .. 43
Mr. Ward .. 44
Mr. C. E. Price .. 45
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) .. 45
Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire) .. 45
Sir F. Banbury .. 46
Mr. Harcourt .. 47
Sir W. Evans Gordon .. 48
Mr. Ashley .. 48
Mr. Harcourt .. 48
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) .. 48
Mr. Harcourt .. 50
Mr. Brodie (Surrey Reigate) .. 50

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 33 ; Noes, 174. (Division List No. 100.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

5. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £313,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain, not provided for on other Votes."

Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 52
Mr. Harcourt .. 54
Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 55
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) .. 55
Mr. C. E. Price .. 56
Mr. Morton .. 57
Sir F. Banbury .. 58
Mr. Harcourt .. 58
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) .. 60

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £312,900 be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Mr. Harcourt .. 61
Mr. Carlile .. 62
Mr. Annan Bryce .. 63
Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston) .. 63
Mr. Harcourt .. 64

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 27 ; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 101.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

6. £47,400 to complete the sum for Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain.

Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) .. 67
Mr. Harcourt .. 67

Vote agreed to.

7. £46,600 to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain.

8. £91,000 to complete the sums for Royal Parks and Pleasure Grounds.

Mr. Morton 68
Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 69
Mr. Harcourt 69

Vote agreed to.

9. £32,400 to complete the sum for House of Parliament Buildings.

Mr. Morton 70
Mr. Harcourt 70
Mr. J. Ward 71
Mr. Harcourt 71

Vote agreed to.

10. £2,1000 Salisbury Memorial.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow ; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

Adjournment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House do now adjourn." —(*Mr. J. A. Pease.*)

Mr. Morton 72
Mr. J. A. Pease 72

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at a quarter after Eight o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 9TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

New Writ.—New Writ for the borough of Belfast (North Division), in the room of the right hon. Sir Daniel Dixon, Baronet, deceased.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) 73

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Provisional Order Bills (Standing Orders Applicable Thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the first Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.

Ordered, " That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow." 73

Apr. 9.] *Page*

Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway Abandonment Bill—Read the third time, and passed 73

Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 73

Birmingham Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time and committed 73

PETITIONS.

Advertisements Regulation Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, in favour; to lie upon the Table. 73

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Adlington; Avenue (No. 9) Pit; Bathwell Park; Boney Hay; Braidhurst; Brereton; Brereton (No. 2) Pit; Brownhills; Burntwood; Cannock Chase; Collin's Green; Douglas Water; Ford's; Forth and Wilsontown; Govan; Greenfield; Langtree; Oakengates; and, Thankerton Collieries; to lie upon the Table 73

Colton, William George.—Petition of William George Colton, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 74

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 74

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Brechin, in favour; to lie upon the Table 74

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 74

Housing of the Working Classes, etc., Bill.—Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table 74

Liquor Traffic Local Option (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Arbroath; Carluke; Cathcart; Darvel; Edinburgh (three); Falkirk; Kinross; Kirkwall; Kirkwall and St. Olva; Montrose; Newton; Pentland; Portmahomack; Saint Margaret's Hope, Orkney; Saltcoats; Sandwick; and Stornoway; to lie upon the Table 74

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petition from Altrincham, against; to lie upon the Table 74

Public Libraries Bill.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 74

Purshad, Thakur.—Petition of Thakur Purshad, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 74

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Remuneration of the Consulting Engineers to Crown Colonies and Protectorates.—Return [presented 8th April] to be printed. [No. 103] .. 74

Apr. 9.] *Page*

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of June, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 75

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of February, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 75

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Copy presented, of regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant prescribing the manner in which sporting rights, vested in the Land Commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 13 of the Act, are to be dealt with by the Land Commission [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 75

ARMY.—Copy presented, of General Annual Report on the British Army for the year ending 30th September, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 75

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (GENERAL REPORTS).—Copy presented, of General Report by the Chief Inspector of the Southern Division of Scotland for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 75

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES (SCOTLAND) (BY-LAWS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th November, 1906; *Mr. Marnham*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 104] 75

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1907, dated 22nd March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 75

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).—Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Foreign and Colonial) Amendment (No. 3) Regulations, 1907, dated 20th March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 75

MUNICIPAL TRADING (GERMAN EMPIRE).—Address for "Return showing, so far as the particulars can be obtained, for the following towns of the German Empire, viz.:—Berlin, Bremen, Frankfort-on-Main, Cologne, Düsseldorf, Elberfeld, Strassburg, Stutgart, Munich, Nuremberg, Leipzig, Dresden, Chemnitz, Breslau, Danzig, Königsberg, Mannheim, Magdeburg, Stettin, Hanover, Hamburg, Essen, Brunswick, Barmen, and Dortmund: (1) the salaries of the burgomasters and professional members of the administrative boards; and (2) the nature and extent and, for each of the last four years for which figures are available, the financial results of reproductive municipal undertakings, including, for each undertaking separately, a short description thereof, date, and terms of original acquisition, or establishment, or subsequent extension, how managed, capital employed, and how obtained, value of the undertaking, capital paid off and outstanding, loan charges, provision for depreciation, gross income and expenditure, net profit or loss, how profit is allocated or loss met, amount of relief or burden to taxation, number and salaries of the chief paid officials, number of workpeople, rate of wages paid in chief classes of labour, and prices charged for products or services supplied or rendered."—(*Mr. Chiozza Money*) 75

FLEETS (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES).—Return ordered, "showing the Fleets of Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, United States of America, and Japan, on the 31st day of March, 1907, distinguishing:—Battleships, built and building; cruisers, built and building; coast-defence vessels, built and building; torpedo vessels; torpedo-boat destroyers, torpedo boats, and submarines built and building."

Return to show date of launch, displacement, horse-power and armaments reduced to one common scale (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 129, of Session 1906).—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*) 76

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POPULATION OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 76

USE OF COTTON-STALK FIBRE FOR PAPER-MAKING.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 77

COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF UGANDA RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill 77

REPAYMENT OF CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND.—Question, Mr. Haddock (Lancashire, North Lonsdale); Answer, Mr. Runciman 78

WELSH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STAFF.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. McKenna 78

METROPOLITAN POLICE—ONE DAYS' REST IN SEVEN.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 78

METROPOLITAN POLICE LIBRARY FUND.—Question, Dr. Cooper; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 79

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 79

REPATRIATION OF CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 80

MR. STEAD AND THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Haddock (Lancashire, North Lonsdale); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 80

HOUSE OF COMMONS POLICE.—Question, Mr. Haddock; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 81

ROYAL SCOTTISH MUSEUM.—Questions, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rosendale) 81

LUNE FISHERY BOARD.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 82

IRISH ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S CLERK.—Question, Mr. Haddock; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 82

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Richard Durning Holt, esquire, for the County of Northumberland (Hexham Division) 83

Apr. 9.] *Page*

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY BILL.—Order for Second Reading To-morrow read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 83

NEW BILL.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES (NO. 2) BILL.—"To establish a single Franchise at all elections, and thereby to abolish university representation and to remove the Disabilities of Women," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 147] 83

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"

Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 83

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that,' in order to insert, 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.' "—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Seecrtary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick*) 98

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 110
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 122
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 130
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 139
Viscount Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 147
Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (*Wiltshire, Chippenham*) 152
Viscount Valentia (*Oxford*) 158
Mr. Brodie (*Surrey, Reigate*) 161
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (*Lincolnshire, Horncastle*) 164
Colonel Herbert (*Monmouthshire, S.*) 169
Mr. Arthur Lee (*Hampshire, Fareham*) 172
The Financial Secretary to the War Office (*Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.*) 183

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Arnold-Forster*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Apr. 9.] *Page*

SUPPLY [8TH APRIL] REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS I.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £43,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Royal Palaces."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Osborne."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £50,700, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, and for the maintenance of certain Cemeteries abroad."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £427,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office, and Post Office Telegraph Buildings in Great Britain, and certain Post Offices abroad, including Furniture, Fuel, and sundry Miscellaneous Services."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £313,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain, not provided for on other Votes."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £47,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £46,600, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Miscellaneous Legal Buildings."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £91,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

9 "That a sum, not exceeding £32,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Houses of Parliament Buildings."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the execution and erection of a monument in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the the late Right Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury."

First Two Resolutions agreed to.

Third Resolution, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,700, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, and for the maintenance of certain Cemeteries abroad," read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London) 191

Resolution agreed to.

Fourth to Seventh Resolutions agreed to.

Eighth Resolution, "That a sum, not exceeding £91,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens," read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Morton 192

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Subsequent Resolutions to be considered to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 10TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Barry Railway Bill (By Order); Taff Vale Railway Bill (by Order); Port Talbot Railway and Dock Bill (by Order); Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed .. 193

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. 193

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 193

Apr. 10.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Petitions in favour; from Aberbeeg; Abercarn; Abertillery (two); Alloa and Devon; Alva; Arrail Griffin; Blackhill (two); Bloxwich; Cadder; Camp; Caradog Vale; Celynen; Chapel New Mains; Clackmannan; Crown Lodge; Cwm; Cwmtillery; Diamond; Garswood; Guenoo; Halifax; Kendon Lodge; Llankilleth; Lletty Shenkin; Merthyr Vale; Miskin; Motherwell; Mount Avernon; Old Hills; Parkhead; Pelsall; Penyfan; Quarry Bank; Rose Heyworth; Shettleston; Tillery; Tillicoultry; Tollercross; Troedyrhiw; Twyn Gwyn; Vivian; and, West Longrigg Collieries; to lie upon the Table 193

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Arbroath and St. Vigeans, against; to lie upon the Table 193

Feus and Building Leases (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Dalziel, in favour; to lie upon the Table 193

Liquor Traffic Local Option (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour; from Battyhill; Dalziel; Glasgow (three); Inverness; Kilmalcolm; Kirkintilloch; Melsetter; Motherwell; Saltcoats; and, Skelmorlie; to lie upon the Table 193

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petitions against: from Bollington Holy Trinity; Kingston-on-Thames; and, Knowle (Bristol); to lie upon the Table 194

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

East India Punjab (Inquiry into Deaths from Tetanus).—Return presented relative thereto [Address 26th March; *Sir William Collins*]; to lie upon the Table 194

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3755 to 3757 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 194

Railways Abandonment.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Great Central Railway Bill, and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158b]; referred to the Committee on the Bill 194

Reformatory and Industrial Schools (Great Britain).—Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1906. Part I. List of Schools and Detailed Reports [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 194

Polling Districts (County of Essex).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Essex dividing the Bowers Gifford Polling District in the Mid-Essex Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 194

Government Institutions (Ireland).—Return ordered, "of the Government Institutions, Military, Police, Prisons, &c., in Ireland, giving particulars of the supplies annually procured; whether or not the contracts for the same are advertised in Ireland and are open to general competition, and the addresses of the officials who control these contracts."—(*Mr. Boland*) .. 194

Apr. 10.] Page

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.—Return ordered, "of the Amounts of British Government Securities held by the several Government Departments and other Public Offices on the 31st day of March, 1907, specifying whether held in England or Ireland (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 163, of Session 1906):

£2½ per Cent. Consols.	£2¾ per Cents. (1905).	£2½ per Cents.	£2¾ per Cent. War Loan.	Other Securities.	
				Annuities for terms of years.	Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills.

—(*Mr. Runciman*) 195

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).—Address for "Return of the net Income and Expenditure of British India under certain specified heads for the eleven years from 1895–6 to 1905–06 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 116, of Session 1906)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler*) 195

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PAY BY FIRE INSURANCE COMPANIES TOWARDS THE UPKEEP OF FIRE BRIGADES.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 195

BATTLESHIPS, ETC., STRUCK OFF AND LAID DOWN.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 196

PANAMA CANAL WORKS—TRINIDAD LABOURERS' CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Churchill 199

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH COLONISTS AT NAIROBI.—Question, Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 199

EUROPEAN AND NATIVE POPULATION AT NAIROBI.—Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Churchill, ... 200

BALANCES IN HANDS OF BOARDS OF GUARDIANS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. John Burns 200

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL—DATE OF INTRODUCTION.—Question, Mr. Brodie (Surrey, Reigate); Answer, Mr. John Burns 201

PAY OF MALE CLERICAL STAFF OF THE POST OFFICE TELEPHONE SERVICE.—Question, Sir J. Baker (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 201

THE POLICE SUPERANNUATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Brodie; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 202

WAGES OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr Lloyd George 202

ACCIDENTS TO RAILWAY SERVANTS.—Question, Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 203

Apr. 10.| *Page*

Children in Council and Voluntary Schools.—Question, Mr. Armitage (Leeds, Central); Answer, Mr. McKenna 205

Sedition of Bombay Newspaper.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 205

Opium Exported from India.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Morley 207

Suggested Increased Allowances for Officers Serving in South Africa.—Question, Mr. Brodie; Answer, Mr. Haldane 207

The Sherwood Foresters—Coloured Facings to Uniforms.—Question, Mr. Gibbs (Bristol, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 207

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Cost of Naval Construction.—Question, Mr. Nuttall (Lancashire, Stretford); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 208

Cost of H.M.S. "Invincible."—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer Mr. Edmund Robertson 208

Cost of H.M.S. "Dreadnought".—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 208

Battleship Reserve Guns.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 209

Woolwich Arsenal.—Questions, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), and Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 209

Army Bill—Militia Volunteer Officer.—Question, Mr. Harmood Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Haldane 210

Indian Legislative Councils.—Questions, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) and Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 211

Native Labour in Transvaal Mines.—Questions, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 211

Sir A. Swettenham's Resignation.—Questions, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone), Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) and Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answers, Mr. Churchill 212

The Bahr-el-Ghazel.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. 213

Sale of Revolvers.—Question, Mr. G. H. Faber (Boston); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. 214

St. Pancras Unemployed.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 214

Leicester Distress Committee.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. John Burns 215

Apr. 10.] *Page*

Rifle Ranges for Postal Officials.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 215

Sharlston Elementary School Teacher.—Questions, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) and Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 216

Molascuit.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 217

Labourers' Cottages in County Down.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 218

The Drainage of the Barrow.—Questions, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix) and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answers, Mr. Birrell .. 219

Keelnabrack School.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 221

Glencar Potato Crop Failure.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell 221

Mr. Pakenham's Mullingar Estate.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 222

Evicted Tenants Bill and Future Tenants.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 222

General Fetherstonhaugh's Estate.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 223

Crannagh Farm Boycott.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 223

United Irish League and the Gore-Booth Tenant.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) and Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 224

Irish Poor Law Administration.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 226

Crannagh Farm Boycott.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Birrell .. 226

Protestant Children in Catholic Schools.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 227

Elphin Disturbances.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 228

Irish Local Government Officials.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Birrell 228

Hillsborough Labourers' Cottage Rents.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 229

Barnmeen School House.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 229

REGISTRY OF DEEDS OFFICE, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Meehan; Answer, Mr. Runciman 231

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS STAFF.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 231

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) and Viscount Turnour; Answers, Mr. Morley 231

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure (in respect of the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill): The Lord Advocate; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

Report to lie upon the Table 232

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field,' "—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof—

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon) 232
Mr. Acland (Yorkshire, Richmond) 248
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 255
Major Dunne (Walsall) 263
Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-upon-Trent) 266
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 273
Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.) 276
Major McMicking (Kirkcudbrightshire) 279
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) 284
Mr. A. L. Lever (Essex, Harwich) 287
Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester) 289
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 291

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, further proceeding was postponed without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 4.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND LAND PURCHASE.

Mr. Toulmin (Lancashire, Bury) 294
Mr. Walters (Sheffield, Brightside) 301

Apr. 10.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, a measure is urgently needed enabling local authorities to acquire, by agreement or compulsorily, and by simple and inexpensive machinery, such land within or adjoining their several districts as may, in their judgment, be needed for the requirements of the inhabitants; and further that, in all such cases of land acquisition, the purchase price should be definitely based upon the value at which such land is assessed for purposes of taxation."—(*Mr. Toulmin.*)

Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 306
Mr. George Roberts (*Norwich*) 310
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (*Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.*) 314
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 320
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 323
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 325

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to leave out from the word 'be' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'based upon a fair valuation.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 172; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 102.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Postponed proceeding on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof, resumed.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow 327

SUPPLY [8TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th April], "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the Resolution, 'That a sum not exceeding £91,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens.'"

Question again proposed.

Question put, and agreed to 328

SUPPLY [8TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for Consideration of Ninth and Tenth Resolutions.

Resolutions agreed to 328

Adjourned at a quarter after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 11TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Brockenhurst Gas Bill (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed 329

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed 329

Maidstone Gas Bill—Read the third time, and passed.. 329

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill (BY ORDER); Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway (General Powers) Bill (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed 329

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments (Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 329

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).—Mr. Soames reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Wednesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 329

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 329

Apr. 11.] *Page*

Byrne's Divorce Bill [LORDS].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, with Minutes of Proceedings; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 329

Fitz-Gerald's Divorce Bill [LORDS].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, with Minutes of Proceedings; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 329

Galway's Divorce Bill [LORDS].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, with Minutes of Proceedings; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 329

Galway's Divorce Bill [LORDS]; Fitz-Gerald's Divorce Bill [Lords], and Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings in the House of Lords on the Second Reading of Galwey's Divorce Bill [Lords], Fitz-Gerald's Divorce Bill [Lords], and Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords], together with the Documents deposited in each case, be returned to the House of Lords; and that the Clerk do carry the same.—(*Mr. Attorney-General*) 330

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Billinge; Bryn; Conduit; Dillwyn; Gallihir; Garswood Hall; Haydock; Lancashire, Cheshire, and North Wales Enginemen and Boilermen; Netherburn; New Foundation; Newtown; New Winnings; Onllwyr; Pinxton; South Normanton; Stonehouse; Walkden; and Wyndham Collieries; to lie upon the Table 330

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table 330

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Alloa; Alva; Auchterarder; Castletown; Congregational Union of Scotland; Dalmuir West; Edinburgh (four); Falkirk; Glasgow; Greenock (four); Lauder; Methill; Port Glasgow; Renfrew; Sanquhar; and Windygates; to lie upon the Table 330

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.—Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 330

RAILWAYS (CONTRACTS) BILL.—Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 330

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BRITISH MUSEUM.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th February; *Mr. Rothschild*]; to lie upon the table, and to be printed. [No. 105] .. 331

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Statement showing the amount of the Special Grants paid during the financial year 1906–7 in aid of certain Local Education Authorities in England and Wales [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 331

Apr. 11.] *Page*

PUBLIC RECORDS.—Copy presented, of Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 331

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Ipswich and the Urban District Council of Wallasey, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 331

ROYAL OBSERVATORY (EDINBURGH).—Copy presented, of Seventeenth Annual Report of the Astronomer Royal for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 331

HOMICIDE (PUNISHMENT IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES).—Address for "Return of the various Punishments for Homicidal Crime provided by the penal codes of the following Countries, viz.: France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Spain, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Portugal, Russia, and the United States of America."—(*Mr. George Greenwood*) 331

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

WELSH PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 331

EXCHEQUER AND AUDIT DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 332

SUGAR DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Remnant; Answer, Mr. Asquith 332

IRISH LAND PURCHASE LOANS.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Asquith 333

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 333

INCOME-TAX.—Question, Mr. Billson (Staffordshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 333

CIVIL PENSION.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce; Answer, Mr. Asquith 334

JAPANESE PHARMACOPŒIA.—Question, Mr. Goddard Clarke (Camberwell, Peckham); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 334

RECRUITMENT OF NATIVE LABOUR IN PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 335

CROWN AGENTS' CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Brodie (Surrey, Reigate); Answer, Mr. Churchill 335

SIR ALEXANDER SWETTENHAM.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill 335

CUSTOMS SENIOR ASSISTANT CLERKS.—Questions, Mr. Thornton and Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton); Answers, Mr. Runciman 336

CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE—EMPLOYMENT OF EX-SOLDIERS.—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 336

Apr. 11.] *Page*

Kilmarnock Court House.—Question, Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 336

Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks.—Question, Mr. Remnant; Answer, Mr. Asquith 336

Bengal Opium.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley 341

Snake Poisoning in India.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Mr. Morley 342

Dublin Housing Difficulty.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 343

Higher Education in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 343

Lord Kilmorey's County Down Estate.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 344

Irish Government Bill.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 344

Draperstown Sewerage.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 344

Battery Sergeant-Majors and Quarter-Master Sergeants.—Question, Mr. Clavell Salter (Hants, Basingstoke); Answer, Mr. Haldane 345

Limerick Barracks.—Question, Mr. Brodie (Surrey, Reigate); Answer, Mr. Haldane 345

Cost of the Army.—Question, Mr. Brodie; Answer, Mr. Haldane 346

Sergeant-Major Henson, R.H.A.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Haldane 347

Superannuation.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 347

Colonial Conference.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 347

Small Holdings Bill.—Question, Mr. Brodie; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 348

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Gibraltar Dockyard.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 348

Greenock Generating Station.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancs., Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 348

Sir John Fisher's Pay.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 349

Sea Lord's Salaries.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 349

Apr. 11.] *Page*

ENGINEER OFFICERS' SHORE APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 349

H.M.S. "BLAKE" AND "BLENHEIM."—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) and Mr. Arthur Lee (Hants., Fareham); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson 350

TERRITORIAL FORCES' ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 350

BRIGADE MAJORS OF VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Mr. Carlile (Herts., St. Albans); Answer, Mr. Haldane 351

ROYAL ARSENAL, WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Haldane 351

CHICAGO MEAT PACKING ESTABLISHMENTS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. Haldane 352

CHINA AND INDIAN OPIUM.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Boroughs) 352

INDIAN BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs); Answer, Mr. Morley 352

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND CHAPLAINS IN INDIA.—Questions, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries, Burghs); Answers, Mr. Morley 353

BACTERIOLOGICAL INSTITUTE IN MAURITIUS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 354

TRINIDAD LOCAL CUSTOMS TARIFF.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Churchill 355

IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN EAST AFRICA—CASES OF CAPTAIN GROGAN AND MR. BOWKER.—Questions, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham), Mr. Carlile, Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston), Mr. Ashley, Captain Faber (Hants., Andover) and Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 355

JUDGES IN BRITISH EAST AFRICA.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 358

WHITE SETTLERS IN BRITISH EAST AFRICA.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker and Sir J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 358

BRITISH EAST AFRICAN ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 359

NEW HEBRIDES CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) and Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 359

NEW HEBRIDES CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 360

Apr. 11.] *Page*

CONGO FREE STATE ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 361

SWEDEN AND NORWAY.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 361

SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRAFFIC CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 362

EGYPTIAN SECRET SERVICE FUNDS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 362

EGYPTIAN CONCESSIONS BOARDS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 362

EGYPTIAN LANDHOLDERS—PENALTIES FOR INFRACTION OF RULES.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 363

NEWSPAPERS IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 363

BRITISH CONSULAR SERVICE IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 364

EGYPTIAN MILK SUPPLY.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 364

CATTLE DISEASE IN EGYPT.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 364

PRISON WARDERS' GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 365

THE PREROGATIVE OF MERCY.—Questions, Mr. C. B. Harmsworth (Worcestershire, Droitwich) and Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. 366

DEPORTATION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 367

INSPECTION OF UNDERGROUND BAKEHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Wilkie (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 367

ELECTRIC TRAMCAR FATALITIES.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. 368

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES.—Questions, Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead) and Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 368

NEWTON HEATH RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—Question, Mr. Wardle (Stockport); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 368

HAMBURG DOCK STRIKE.—Questions, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmonth); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 369

SALE OF DISCARDED WAR STORES IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 369

Apr. 11.] Page

ERITH RELIEF WORKS.—Question, Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford); Answer, Mr. John Burns 370

GLAMORGANSHIRE EDUCATION ESTIMATES.—Question, Lord R. Cecil; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 370

ROYSTON SCHOOLMASTER.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton); Answer, Mr. McKenna 371

HIS MAJESTY'S SCHOOL INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Clough; Answer, Mr. McKenna 372

MONMOUTHSHIRE EDUCATION COMMITTEE.—Question, Lord R. Cecil; Answer, Mr. McKenna 372

BUTTER ADULTERATION.—Question, Mr. Nuttall (Lancashire, Stretford); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 373

GREENOCK PRISON GOVERNORSHIP.—Questions, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) and Mr. Watts; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 373

TRAINING OF SCOTTISH TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Gulland; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 374

RIVER ANNAN FISHERY.—Question, Mr. Gulland; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 374

DRIVER GOURLAY'S SENTENCE.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 374

IRISH EDUCATION UNIVERSITY BILL.—Question, Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 375

CUSACK ESTATE COTTAGE LOAN.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 375

CUSACK ESTATE—EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. J. C. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 375

"GRABBING" AT LANESBOROUGH.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 376

IRISH LINEN DAMASK.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), and Mr. Liddell (Down, W.); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 377

BLOCKING MOTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 377

ROYAL BOUNTY FUND.—Question, Mr. Carlile; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 379

SCOTTISH PRIVY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—Questions, Mr. Morton and Mr. Smeaton; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerma 380

Apr. 11.] Page

NEGLIGENT PARENTS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 381

IRISH BILLS.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 381

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Evelyn Cecil; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 381

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 382

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Annan Bryce; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 383

LAND VALUATION BILLS.—Question, Mr. Findlay (Lanarkshire, N.E.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 383

HEXHAM ELECTION.—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), and Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 383

CHARITY COMMISSION VOTE.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 383

THE COMMITTEE OF DEFENCE.—Questions, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 385

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh Districts) 385
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 388

RESIGNATION OF LORD CROMER.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 390
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 391

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 392

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Irish Tobacco Bill: Mr. Runciman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Gordon, Colonel M'Calmont. Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Boland, Mr. Gwynn, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Dolan, Mr. Hazleton, and Mr. Reddy 393

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

Blind (Technical Education, etc.) Bill.—" To provide for the Technical Education, Employment, and Maintenance of the Blind," presented by Mr. Steadman; supported by Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Clynes, Mr. Jowett, and Mr. Ward; to be read a second time upon Friday, 10th May, and to be printed. [Bill 148] 393

Small Holdings (No. 3) Bill.—" To further facilitate the provision of Small Holdings in England and Wales," presented by Mr. George Hardy; supported by Sir Francis Channing, Mr. Lynch, Mr. George White, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Levy Lever, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Vickerman Rutherford, Mr. Essex, Mr. Rowlands, and Mr. Stephen Collins; to be read a second time upon Friday, 10th May, and to be printed. [Bill 149] 393

Open Spaces (Scotland) Bill.—" To facilitate the acquisition of Open Spaces by Local Authorities in Scotland," presented by Mr. McCrae; supported by Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Younger, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Cleland, and Mr. Dundas White; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 150] 393

Patents and Designs (No. 2) Bill.—" To amend the Law relating to Patents and Designs," presented by Mr. Dundas White; supported by Mr. Shipman, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Findlay, and Mr. Henry Anderson Watt; to be read a second time upon Friday, 26th April, and to be printed. [Bill 151] 394

Parliamentary Voters (Registration) Bill.—" To amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters; and for other purposes relating to Elections," presented by Mr. Cremer; supported by Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Bell, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. John Ward, Mr. Maddison, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham); to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 152] 394

Trust Investment Bill.—" To amend the Law as to the Investment of Trust Funds in municipal and other similar securities and as to the Investment of any money which local authorities are authorised or required to invest," presented by Mr. Harmood-Banner; supported by Mr. Armitage and Mr Scott; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 153] 394

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Motion made, and Question put, " That the proceedings on the Consideration of the Business of the House (Procedure) have precedence this day of the Business of Supply."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 324; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 103) .. 394

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Motion made, and Question put, " That the Proceedings on the Consideration of the Business of the House (Procedure), if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 320; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 104) .. 397

Apr. 11.] *Page*

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Ordered, That Mr. Lonsdale be discharged from the Committee of Public Accounts.

Ordered, That Mr. Bowles be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Whiteley*) 403

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [20th March] as amended:—" (1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time,-may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to—(*a*) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills; or (*b*) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall without further debate put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 403
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 408

Amendment proposed—

" In line 9, after the word 'Bills,' to insert the words 'or Bills involving any aid, grant, or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of money to be provided by Parliament, or involving any charge upon the people.' "—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (*Sir Henry Fowler, Wolverhampton, E.*) 411
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 413
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 416
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 418
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 421
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 422
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs*) 423
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 426
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 427

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

" After the first word 'or,' to insert the words 'clauses of.' "—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 427
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 428
Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 429
Mr. A. J. Balfour 429
Mr. McKenna 430
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 431
Mr. William Rutherford 432

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 78 ; Noes, 314. (Division List No. 105.)

Question again proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 313 ; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 106.)

Question put accordingly, " That those words be there inserted."

The House divided :—Ayes, 79 ; Noes, 314. (Division List No. 107.)

Mr. Laurence Hardy 445
Mr. Ashley (*Lancs., Blackpool*) 446

Amendment proposed—

" In line 10, at the end, to insert the words ' (c) Bills relating to Parliamentary reform or franchise.' "—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy*).

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 447
Mr. A. J. Balfour 448
Mr. Dalziel 451
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 451

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 46 ; Noes, 287. (Division List No. 108.)

Sir F. Banbury 455
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 459

Amendment proposed—

" In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, ' (c) Bills modifying or taking away any of the powers of the Crown or either House of Parliament.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Questions proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Apr. 12.] Page

Mr. McKenna 460
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 461
Viscount Helmsley (Yorks., N.R., Thirsk) 463
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 463
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 465
Mr. Dalziel 466
Sir Wm. Anson (Oxford University) 467
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 468
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 468
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 470
Mr. A. J. Balfour 471

Question put.

The House divided :—Aye, 65 ; Noes, 313. (Division List No. 109).

Sir F. Banbury 477
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 477

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at end, to add, (c) 'Bills dealing with the organisation of the Army or Reserve forces, or with the Navy.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 480
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 481
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 482

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 483
Mr. Dalziel 486
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 486

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 288 ; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 110.)

Debate to be resumed on Monday next.

And it being half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at ten minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 12TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 493

Apr. 12] *Page*

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed 493

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bath, Handforth, Liverpool, Nantwich, Penryn, Pontardawe (rural), Sheffield, and the South Staffordshire Joint Smallpox Hospital District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns, read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 154] 493

Great Central Railway Bill.—Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 493

PETITIONS.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Clackmannan; Edinburgh; Girvan; Johnstone and district; and, St. Andrew's and District; to lie upon the Table 493

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Banchory; Barrhead; Benholm; Blairgowrie; Blairgowrie and Rattray; Carluke; Coenhill; Crail; Dingwall; Edinburgh; Glasgow (two); Glengarnock; Kinning Park; Largo; Larkhall; Leith; Lochmaber; Motherwell; Paisley (four); Portobello; Sanquhar; and, Southend (Argyll); to lie upon the Table 493

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Carlisle, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 493

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL.—Petition from Paisley; to lie upon the Table .. 494

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 494

SHOPS BILL.—Petition from Paisley, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 494

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.—Petition from Devon and Cornwall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 494

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Acorn Lodge, Cannock; Agecroft; Altham; Annesley; Atherton; Babbington; Bamfurlong; Bank Hall; Bargoed; Batonrigg; Bestwood; Bickershaw; Blainscough; Bower; Brackley; Bridgewater; Brook; Brynteg; Burnley; Carberry; Chissnall (Nos. 1 and 2); Clifton (two); Coalburn; Crooke; Cymmer Drift; Deep Pit, Rawnsley; East Cannock (two); Ellenbrook; Ellesmere; Gilfach Goch; Gilwem; Gipsy Pit; Godngraig; Grange; Gwauncaegurwen; Heath Hayes; Henllys Vale; Hewlett (No. 2 Pit); Hindley Field; Hindley Grammar Pit; Hindley Green; Hindley Hall; Hindley Trafford Pit; Hulton Park; Hulton's Deep; Leacroft; Leeswood; Linby; Littleton (two); Loanhead; Lower Ince; Maypole; Newbattle; New Cwmgorse; Newton; Niddrie; Old Hednesford; Pilkington; Platt Bridge; Polton; Rawnsley; Sandywood; Silver Hill; Smeaton; Standish; Sutton; Tingley; Tirbach; Trencherbone; Trowell Moor; Wallyford; Welsh Whittle; West Cannock (Nos. 1 and 3 and No. 1 Upcast); West Houghton (Hewlett Pit); Wigan (Ladies Lane); Wimblebury; Worsley Mesnes; and, York Collieries; to lie upon the Table 494

Coal Mines Regulation Bill.—Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table .. 494

Colton, William George.—Petition of William George Colton, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table .. 494

Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill.—Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table .. 495

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions against; from Alloa; Crieff; Edinburgh; Linlithgow; Portobello; and, St. Andrew's; to lie upon the Table .. 495

Infant Life Protection Bill.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 495

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

East India (Punjab) (Inquiry into Deaths from Tetanus).—Return [presented 10th April] to be printed. [No. 106] .. 495

Marriages, Births, and Deaths (England).—Copy presented, of General Abstract of Marriages, Births, and Deaths registered in England and Wales in the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 495

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3758 to 3762 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 495

Army.—Copy presented, of Amendments to Rules for Military Prisons and Detention Barracks [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 495

Education (Scotland).—Copy presented, of General Report by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie, on the Teaching of School and Personal Hygiene to Students in Training as Teachers in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 495

Technical Education (Scotland).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June, 1906; Mr. Sinclair]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 107] .. 495

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Temporary Employment of Women Telegraphists in the Post Office.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 496

Leadless Glaze in Government Buildings.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Harcourt .. 496

Education Grants and Rates in Scotland.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 497

Expenditure on Police in Scotland.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 497

Scottish Churches Commission Awards.—Question, Sir Arthur Bignold (Wick Burghs); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 498

Apr. 12.] *Page*

EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. Lough 498

POPULATION OF ENGLAND AND WALES AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 499

EXPENDITURE BY BOARDS OF AGRICULTURE IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 500

MAP READING FOR SOLDIERS.—Question, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 501

WAR OFFICE CONTRACTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 501

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Walsh (Lancashire, Ince) 501
Mr. E. Edwards (Hanley) 508

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. J. Johnson (Gateshead) 511
Mr. Cory (Cornwall, St. Ives) 516
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) 521
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 525
Colonel Herbert (Monmouthshire, S.) 527
Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone) 528
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 531
Mr. Findlay (Lanarkshire, N.E.) 534
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 535
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 536
Mr. Russell Rea (Gloucester) 545
Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 546

Mr. WALSH rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 273 ; Noes, 34. (Division List No. 111.)

Question "That this Bill be now read a second time," put accordingly, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."
Sir Francis Powell 552
Sir F. Banbury 553
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 554
Mr. Lambton 556
Sir Christopher Furness 556
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 556

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 279 ; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 112.)

Apr. 15.] *Page*

Sweated Industries Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) 559

And, it being Five o'clock, the debate stood adjourned.

SELECTION.—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection, "That they have nominated the following five Members to serve on the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, on the Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill and the Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill :—Mr. Charles Duncan, Sir John Randles, Mr. Rose, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Luke White.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at two minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 15TH APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [H.L.]; Humber Conservancy Bill [H.L.]; Borax Consolidated Bill [H.L.]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [H.L.]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [H.L.]; Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.] —Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 561

Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]—Petition for additional provision; of the Coventry Corporation under their Common Seal, together with the proposed clauses and Amendments annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners 561

Basingstoke Gas Bill; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill; Brockenhurst Gas Bill; Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill; Maidstone Gas Bill; Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 561

Byrne's Divorce Bill [H.L.]—Message from the Commons for copy of the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings taken before this House, together with the documents deposited in the case. Ordered to be communicated, with a request that they may be returned 561

Galway's Divorce Bill [H.L.].; Fitzgerald's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Minutes of evidence and proceedings before this House on the Second Reading, together with the documents deposited in the cases, returned from the Commons 561

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee

Apr. 15.] *Page*

Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.]; Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Marquess of Zetland be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Zouche of Haryngworth; read, and agreed to 561

Glasgow Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [H.L.].—The meeting of the Select Committee (which stands appointed for Tuesday the 30th instant) put off to Monday the 6th of May next 562

PETITIONS.

JUDICATURE BILL. [H.L.].—Petition against, of Manchester Incorporated Law Association; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 562

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers, having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty, had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.—

1. Treaty Series, No. 11 (1907). Accessions of British Colonies, etc., to various Treaty engagements between the United Kingdom and Foreign Powers. (March 27.)

2. Militia Units. Return showing the establishment of each unit of Militia in the United Kingdom, and the numbers present, absent, and wanting to complete at the training of 1906 (in continuation of [Cd. 2697] of session 1906). (March 27.)

3. Bobbinite (Departmental Committee). Report of the Departmental Committee on Bobbinite; Report and appendices. (March 27.)

4. Explosives (Explosion of Nitro-Glycerine at Ardeer, near Stevenston, Ayrshire)—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the circumstances attending an explosion of nitro-glycerine which occurred at the factory of Nobel's Explosives Company, Limited, at Ardeer, near Stevenston, Ayrshire, on 5th February, 1907. (27th March.)

5. Colonies (General)—Circular dispatch, dated 15th February, 1907, relative to the part taken by ex-Governors of Colonies in the organisation or direction of companies formed to operate in territories which they were recently administering. (27th March.)

6. Trade Reports—I. Annual Series.

No. 3752. Belgium (Port of Antwerp; Shipping and Navigation for 1906).

No. 3753. Santo Domingo (Trade for the First Six Months of 1906). (4th April.)

No. 3754. Portugal (Trade of the Azores for 1906). (6th April.)

Apr. 15.] *Page*

No. 3755. Sudan (Trade of Port Sudan for 1906).

No. 3756. Honduras (Trade for 1905–1906).

No. 3757. Venezuela (Trade of Ciudad Bolivar for 1906). (10th April.)

No. 3758. Bolivia (Trade for 1906).

No. 3759. France (Trade of New Caledonia for 1906).

No 3760. Honduras (Trade of Puerto Cortes for 1906).

No. 3761. Chile (Trade of Coquimbo for 1906).

No. 3762. Portugal (Trade of Oporto for 1906). (13th April.)

II. (Miscellaneous Series).

No. 657. Liquor Traffic Legislation of the United States. (4th April.)

No. 658. Mexican Isthmus (Tehuantepec Railway). (6th April.)

7. Egypt, No. 1. (1907)—Reports by His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General on the finances, administration, and condition of Egypt and the Soudan in 1906. (4th April.)

8. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission)—

I. Calendar of the Stuart Papers belonging to His Majesty the King, preserved at Windsor Castle. Volume III.

II. Report on the manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster, preserved at Grimsthorpe. (4th April.)

9. Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905—Report by the Local Government Board for Scotland as to the proceedings of Distress Committees in Scotland. (4th April.)

10. Mines (Eight-Hour Day for Miners). First Report (with evidence) of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to inquire into the probable economic effect of a limit of eight hours to the working day of coal miners. (4th April.)

11. Railway Accidents—Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ended 31st December, 1906, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871), together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into. Part I. Returns of accidents. (4th April.)

12. Commercial—No. 3. (1907)—Return of Most-Favoured-Nation Clauses in existing treaties of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies: In force on the 1st January, 1907.

No. 4. (1907)—Return of National Treatment Clauses in existing treaties of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies: In force on the 1st January, 1907. (5th April.)

13. Local Government (Scotland). Return of the areas, population, and valuation of counties, burghs, and parishes in Scotland. (6th April.)

14. Police (Scotland). Forty-ninth Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland, for the year ended 31st December, 1906. (6th April.)

15. Army—

I. Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 1907. Memorandum by the Secretary of State of War, with tables showing the war establishments and composition of the proposed field force and other particulars. (8th April.)

II. Memorandum showing how various enactments are affected by the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill. (9th April.)

III. General Annual Report on the British Army for the year ended 30th September, 1906, with which is incorporated the Annual Report of Recruiting prepared by command of the Army Council. (10th April.)

IV. Interim Report of the War Office Committee on the Provision of Officers (*a*) for Service with the Regular Army in War; and (*b*) for the Auxiliary Forces—Minutes of evidence with an appendix on the conference between the committee and the sub-committee of the Headmasters' Conference. (13th April.)

16. Education (Scotland)—

I. General Report by the Chief Inspector of the Southern Division of Scotland, for the year 1906. (10th April.)

II. General Report by Dr. W. Leslie-Mackenzie on the teaching of school and personal hygiene to students in training as teachers in Scotland. (13th April.)

17. Reformatory and Industrial Schools. Fiftieth Report for the year 1906, of the inspector of reformatory and industrial schools: Part I. Lists of schools and detailed reports. (11th April.)

18. Public Records. Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. (12th April.)

19. Board of Education (Special Grants). Statement showing the amount of the special grants paid during the financial year 1906–1907 in aid of certain local education authorities in England and Wales. (12th April.)

20. Royal Observatory (Edinburgh). Seventeenth Annual Report of the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland. (13th April.)

Apr 15.] *Page*

21. Marriages, Births and Deaths. General abstract of marriages, births, and deaths registered in England and Wales in the year 1906. (13th April.)

22. Imports and Exports at Prices of 1900. Tables showing for each of the years 1900–1906, the estimated value of the imports and exports of the United Kingdom at the prices prevailing in 1900, with an introductory memorandum (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 2894], 1906). (13th April.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 562

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY (TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES) BILL, 1907.—Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War, with tables showing the war establishments and composition of the proposed field force and other particulars 566

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant prescribing the manner in which sporting rights vested in the Land Commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 13 of the Act are to be dealt with by the Land Commission 566

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of June, 1906.

(Proceedings.) Return for the month of February, 1907 566

BARONETAGE.—Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into certain matters connected with the baronetage; report and appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table 566

ARMY.—Amendments to rules for military prisons and detention barracks .. 566

GOVERNMENT INSURANCES AND ANNUITIES.—Account of all Moneys received on account of contracts for the grant of deferred life annuities and for payments on death, and of the disposal thereof; and of the contracts made for the year ended 31st December, 1906 566

EGYPTIAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1885.—Account up to 31st March, 1907 .. 567

GREEK LOAN OF 1898.—Account up to 31st March, 1907 567

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated 16th March, 1907, removing the office of Assistant to the Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew from the operation of Section 4 of the Superannuation Act, 1859 567

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.—Account of moneys received and paid by the Chamberlain of the City of London for the year 1906; also account of extraordinary works executed other than general repairs for the same period 567

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FUND (ACCOUNTS 1905–1906).—Accounts of receipts and payments by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Irish Land Purchase Fund, in the year ended 31st March, 1906, together with the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon 567

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).—The Postal Order (Foreign and Colonial) Amendment (No. 3) Regulations, 1907, dated 20th March, 1907; (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, Rhodesia). The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1907, dated 22nd March, 1907 567

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF ESSEX).—Order made by council of county of Essex, dividing the Bowers Gifford Polling District in the Mid-Essex Parliamentary Division 567

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—(Borough of Ipswich.) Order made by the council of the borough of Ipswich, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough. (Urban District of Wallasey.) Order made by the council of the urban district of Wallasey, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban district 567

GAS COMPANIES (METROPOLIS).—Account of the Metropolitan gas companies for the year 1906 567

INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).—Return of all loans raised in England under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament, chargeable on the revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended 31st March, 1907, with the rates of interest and total amounts payable thereon, and the date of the termination of each loan, the debt incurred during the half-year, the moneys raised thereby during the half-year, the loans paid off or discharged during the half year, and the loans outstanding at the close of the half-year; stating, so far as the public convenience will allow, the purpose or service for which moneys have been raised during the half-year 567

COURT OF SESSION (SCOTLAND).—Act of sederunt to regulate procedure in the Court of Session 567

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1906.—Orders by the Secretary for Scotland: With regard to the establishment, powers, etc., of the new Board of Trustees and the purposes for which certain buildings shall be held; allocating certain sums out of the general fund of the Board of Manufactures 567

LOCAL LOANS FUND (ACCOUNTS, 1905–1906)—Accounts of receipts and payments by the Commissioners of the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income for the local loans fund, for the year ended 31st March, 1906; together with a Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereen.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 568

House adjourned at half-past Four o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

Apr. 15.]

Page

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 15TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Manchester Ship Canal (Various Powers) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 569

Byrne's Divorce Bill [LORDS]; Galway's Divorce Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 569

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 569

Central London Railway Bill.—Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 569

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petition from Hucknall Torkard, in favour; to lie upon the Table 569

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Arbroath; and Hamilton; to lie upon the Table 569

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Vale of Leven, against; to lie upon the Table 569

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Ayr, Cambusnethan, Camelon, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Holm, Kilsyth, Kirriemuir, Renton, Rothesay, Stenhousemuir, and Thurso; to lie upon the Table 570

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Camberwell, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 570

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Regulations for the Preliminary Instruction of Elementary School Teachers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 570

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th March; *Dr. Macnamara*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 108] 570

ARMY.—Copy presented of Interim Report of the War Office Committee on the Provision of Officers (a) for Service with the Regular Army in War, and (b) for the Auxiliary Forces. Minutes of Evidence, with an Appendix, on the Conference between the Committee and the Sub-Committee of the Head Masters' Conference [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 570

Apr. 15.] *Page*

BARONETAGE.—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into certain matters connected with the Baronetage. Report and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 570

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS AT PRICES OF 1900.—Copy presented, of Tables showing for each of the years 1900–6 the estimated Value of Imports and Exports of the United Kingdom at the prices prevailing in 1900, with an introductory Memorandum [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 570

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Local Loans Fund, Accounts of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Local Loans Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1906, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 109.] 571

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EXPENDITURE ON LAW AND JUSTICE IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. Macveagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 571

MORALITY OF CHINESE ON THE RAND.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 572

EXPENDITURE ON POLICE IN ENGLAND AND WALES.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 572

SIMON'S BAY DOCKYARD.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 573

EXPENDITURE ON NAVAL SHOOTING PRIZES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 573

NAVY—SPECIAL SERVICE VESSELS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 573

PAY OF CUSTOMS WATCHERS.—Question, Mr. Bowerman (Deptford); Answer, Mr. Runciman 574

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE—CASE OF MR. CHARLES HILL OF SPAXTON.—Question, Mr. Montgomery (Somersetshire, Bridgwater); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 575

INCOME TAX—UNASSESSED DUTY RECOVERED BY INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Asquith 575

COST OF IRISH POLICE.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 576

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 576

IRISH EDUCATION GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 577

ARREARS OF RENT ON THE BLENNERHASSETT ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 577

Apr. 15.] Page

VALUE OF VOLUNTEER DRILL HALLS AND RANGES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Haldane 578

TRANSFER OF VOLUNTEER LIABILITIES FROM PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD TO WAR OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Haldane 578

APPOINTMENT TO POSTMASTERSHIP OF BIRR.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 578

PROMOTION OF IRISH POSTAL OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 579

IRISH POSTAL ORDER BUSINESS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 579

IRISH POSTAL STORES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 580

POSTAL FACILITIES IN COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.) Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 580

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN RAILWAYS—EXAMINATION FOR CLERKSHIPS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-Geroge 581

KING'S BENCH DIVISION CLERKSHIPS—OPEN COMPETITIONS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Cherry 581

IRISH STONE FOR NEW COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 582

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON EMPLOYMENT OF DOMESTICS IN THE NAVY AND RATINGS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 582

ISSUE OF STOKEHOLD BOOTS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 583

CHILDREN EMIGRATED TO CANADA.—Question, Mr. W. Hope (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 583

BOARDED-OUT POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford; Answer, Mr. John Burns 583

NOTTINGHAM UNIVERSITY COLLEGE—CONSTITUTION OF COURT OF GOVERNORS.—Question, Mr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 584

REWARDS FOR SNAKE KILLING IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 584

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF MRS. E. CRAWFORD OF MULAGHGARROW.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 584

IRISH LOAN FUND BOARD AUDITORS.—Queston, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 585

CONDITION OF ROAD FROM PARKMORE TO RED BAY.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 585

SCHOOL FEES IN IRISH MODEL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. T. Harrington (Dublin Harbour); Answer, Mr. Birrell 586

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ROSYTH.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 586

OFFICERS APPOINTED FROM THE RANKS.—Question, Major Renton (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 587

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS.—Question, Major Renton; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 587

UNDER-AGE RECRUITS.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Haldane 588

VOLUNTEER DRILL HALLS AND RIFLE RANGES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Haldane 589

WOOLWICH ARSENAL DISCHARGES.—Questions, Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford), Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answers, Mr. Haldane 589

BOMBAY MUNICIPAL ELECTION.—Question, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 590

LORD KITCHENER'S COMMAND.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid), Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answers, Mr. Morley 290

MAYO COLLEGE.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley 291

AUSTRALIAN STATE PREMIERS AND THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs), Sir William Bull (Hammersmith), and Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 591

ORANGE RIVER COLONY CONSTITUTION.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 592

JUDICIAL POWERS IN NAIROBI.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury), and Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Churchill 592

JAMAICA.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 594

OPIUM TRAFFIC IN CEYLON.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Churchill 594

PERSIAN CUSTOMS CONTROL.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 595

TURKISH CUSTOMS.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Runciman 595

DUTY ON CHOCOLATE.—Questions, Sir William Bull, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire); Answers, Mr. Runciman 595

Apr. 15.] Page

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, Mr. Runciman 596

DEATH DUTIES.—Question, Captain Waring (Banffshire); Answer, Mr. Runciman 597

BUXTON BREWSTER SESSION.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) 597

RAILWAY COMPANY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE LONDON MUNICIPAL SOCIETY.—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.), Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green), and Mr. Austen Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 599

REDDITCH SIGNALMAN'S DUTY.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 600

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 601

LONDON, BRIGHTON AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAY—LIGHTING OF TRAINS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 601

IMPORTS OF DUTIABLE ARTICLES.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 602

LIGHTING OF THE DEVON AND CORNISH COASTS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 602

THE PATENTS AND DESIGNS BILL.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 602

VACCINATION IN WORKHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 603

PRIMARY VACCINATION.—Question, Mr. Lupton: Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 603

KETTERING URBAN COUNCIL AND PHTHISIS.—Question, Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 604

COMPULSORY NOTIFICATION OF PHTHISIS.—Question, Sir F. Channing; Answer, Mr. John Burns 604

INSPECTION OF DAIRIES.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. John Burns 604

SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough), Mr. Arthur Lea (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 606

CANADIAN POSTAGE RATES REDUCTION.—Questions, Sir William Holland (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham), Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 607

Apr. 15.] *Page*

WOODLANDS, ST. MARY POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 608

COIGACK (ROSS-SHIRE) LETTER DELIVERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 609

ENDOWMENTS FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 609

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RETURN.—Questions, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil), Lord R. Cecil; Answers, Mr. McKenna 610

ROYSTON SCHOOL TEACHERSHIP.—Questions, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham), Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barston Ash); Answer, Mr. McKenna 611

SHARLSTON SCHOOL.—Questions, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 612

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Runciman 612

BRITISH MUSEUM READING ROOM.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, Mr. Runciman 613

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.—Question, Mr. Stanger (Kensington, N.); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 613

HOUSE OF COMMONS DINNER—VACCINATED VEAL.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Sir J. A. Jacoby (Derbyshire, Mid.) 613

MEAT INSPECTION IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 614

ELGIN ILLEGAL TRAWLING TRIAL.—Questions, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness), Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 615

IRISH LAND PURCHASE REPAYMENTS.—Questions, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.), Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 616

IRISH GOVERNMENT RETURN.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Newry); Answer, Mr. Birrell 618

IRISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr Birrell 618

IRISH COUNTY COUNCIL, LAND PURCHASE GRANTS.—Questions, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.), Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.), Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Birrell and Mr. Runciman 619

CATHOLICS AND IRISH PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS.—Questions, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Runciman 623

COST OF IRISH POSTAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Barrie; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 624

Apr. 15.] *Page*

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT.—Question, Mr. W. Hope (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) 624

LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND TARIFF REFORM.—Questions, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton), Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor), Mr. Austen Chamberlain; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 625

WOOLWICH ARSENAL DISCHARGES.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.), Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 626

Merchandise Marks Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 110.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 110.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken in to consideration upon Wednesday, 1st May, and to be printed. [Bill 155] 626

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Daniel Daniel Sheehan, esquire, for the Mid Cork Division of the County of Cork 627

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they communicate Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings taken upon the Second Reading of Fitz-Gerald's Divorce Bill [Lords] and Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords], together with the documents deposited in each case as desired by this House, with a request that the same may be returned 627

NEW BILL.

Public Rights of Way (No. 2) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Public Rights of Way," presented by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald; supported by Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Eugene Wason, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Rawlinson, Mr. Hills, Mr. Abel Thomas, Mr. William Redmond, and Mr. Arthur Henderson; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 156] 627

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE) (TERMINATION OF BUSINESS THEREON).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Consideration of the Motion for the termination of the Proceedings upon the Business of the House (Procedure), if under discussion when the Business is postponed, be resumed and proceeded with, though opposed, after the interruption of Business."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 300; Noes, 96. (Division List No. 113.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE) (TERMINATION OF BUSINESS THEREON).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 631

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the proceedings on the Motions with respect to Business of the House (Procedure) shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion on Tuesday, the 16th

day of April, in the following manner, and subjects to the following provisions :—1. At 10 p.m. on that day, Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith the Question on any Amendment or other Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments or other Motions moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but on no other Amendment or Motion), and on any other Question necessary to dispose of the proceedings to be concluded ; 2. On that day the proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House ; 3. On that day no dilatory Motion, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate ; 4. Any opposed private Business which has been set down for consideration on that day shall stand adjourned without Question put until such other day as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 633
Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 639
Mr. Abel Smith (Hertfordshire, Hertford) 641
Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) 642
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 643
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 644
Mr. George Faber (York) 644
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 645
Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) 646
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin S.) 649
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 651
Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) 654

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'Procedure,' to insert the words 'other than so much of such Motions as refers to the establishment of a Scottish Committee.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 655
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 656
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 658
Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 659
Sir A. Acland Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington) 661
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 662
Mr. A. J. Balfour 664
The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Sir Henry Fowler, Wolverhampton, E.) 666

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 108 ; Noes, 314. (Division List No. 114.)

Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent Ashford) 669
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) 672

Apr. 15.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'Procedure,' to insert the words 'other than so much of such Motions as refer to the establishment of a Welsh and Monmouthshire Committee and which apply the Standing Orders 26 and 27 (Closure) to the Standing Committees.'"—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 673
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 675
Mr. Walter Long 676
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 676

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 306 ; Noes, 90. (Division List, No. 115.)

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

House divided :—Ayes, 89 ; Noes, 306. (Division List No. 116.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Evelyn Cecil 685

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. T. L. Corbett (*Down, N.*) 687
Captain Craig (*Down, E.*) 688

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. T. L. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 689
Mr. Cleland (*Glasgow, Bridgeton*) 690
Sir John Kennaway (*Devonshire, Honiton*) 690
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 691
Mr. Verney (*Bucks, N.*) 691

Mr. Carlile (*Herts., St. Albans*) 691
Mr. Sloan (*Belfast, S.*) 692
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 693

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 203 ; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 117.)

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE) (TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS THEREON).

Postponed Proceedings on Question, " That the Proceedings on the Motions with respect to Business of the House (Procedure) shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion on Tuesday, the 16th day of April, in the following manner, and subject to the following provisions :—1. At 10 p.m. on that day, Mr. SPEAKER shall put forwith the Question on any Amendment or other Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments or other Motions moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but on no other Amendment or Motion), and on any other Question necessary to dispose of the proceedings to be concluded ; 2. On that day the proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House ; 3. On that day no dilatory Motion, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate ; 4. Any opposed Private Business which has been set down for consideration on that day shall stand adjourned without Question put until such other day as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine,"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman,*)—resumed.

Question again proposed.

Mr. Evelyn Cecil 698
Sir F. Banbury 700

Amendment proposed—

" In line 2, after the word ' shall,' to insert the words ' be taken on Tuesday and.' "—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.'

Sir Henry Craik 701
Mr. William Rutherford 703
Mr. Pirie 704

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 83 ; Noes, 294. (Division List, No. 118.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 289 ; Noes, 87. (Division List, No. 119.)

Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Motions with respect to Business of the House (Procedure) shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion on Tuesday, the 16th day of April, in the following manner, and subject to the following provisions :—1. At ten p.m. on that day, Mr. SPEAKER shall put forthwith the Question or any Amendment or other Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments or other Motions moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but on no other Amendment or Motion), and on any other Question necessary to dispose of the Proceedings to be concluded ; 2. On that day the proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House ; 3. On that day no dilatory Motion, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate ; 4. Any opposed Private Business which has been set down for consideration on that day shall stand adjourned without Question put until such other day as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [11th April] to Question [20th March]—" (1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to—(a) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills ; or (b) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall, without further debate, put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

" In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, ' (*c*) Bills dealing with the organisation of the Army or Reserve Forces, or with the Navy.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question again proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain 713
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 714
Mr. A. J. Balfour 716
Mr. Abel Smith 717

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 96 ; Noes, 301. (Division List, No. 120.)

Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 721

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 10, at end, to add '(c) Bills relating to the maintenance, organisation, or discipline of the Navy or the naval service; (d) Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom; (e) Bills to give effect to treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements; (f) Bills to sanction the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown.'"—(*Mr. Stuart Wortley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Captain Craig 724

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

NEW BILLS.

NURSES AND PRIVATE NURSING HOMES (REGISTRATION).—Bill to provide for the better Training and Registration of Nurses and for the voluntary Registration of Private Nursing Homes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Claude Hay and Sir Arthur Bignold.

Nurses and Private Nursing Homes (Registration) Bill.—"To provide for the better Training and Registration of Nurses and for the voluntary Registration of Private Nursing Homes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 157.]

ADJOURNMENT—EFFECT OF NEW RULES ON EXISTING STANDING COMMITTEES.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the House do now adjourn.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour 726
Mr. Haldane 727
Mr. William Redmond (*Clare, E.*) 728
Mr. Stanley Wilson 728

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 16TH APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1); London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market).

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—Electric Supply Corporation [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 729

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn 729

Devonport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [H.L.]; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Tees Conservancy Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 729

Byrne's Divorce Bill [H.L.]; Galwey's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 729

Byrne's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Minutes of evidence and proceedings before this House on the Second Reading, together with the documents deposited in the case, returned from the Commons 729

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Buckhaven Dock Bill [H.L.]; Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Northbrook be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Weardale; read, and agreed to 729

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations for the preliminary instruction of elementary school teachers 729

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the period from 1st November, 1903, to 31st December, 1905. Vol. I., Part 1.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 730

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSION ACT, 1865.—Order in Council, dated 26th March, 1907, approving a memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in regard to the pay of men of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve who have qualified in signalling or wireless telegraphy. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 730

THE STANDING ORDERS.

The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Onslow) 730

Moved, That Standing Order No. 128 be amended as follows :—

[NOTE.—The word in small capitals is to be omitted, and the word printed in Italics is to be inserted.]

128. A clause shall be inserted in every Railway Bill prohibiting the payment of any interest or dividend out of any capital which the company have been or may be authorised to raise, either by means of calls, or of any power of borrowing, to any shareholder on the amount of the calls made

in respect of the shares held by him, except such interest on money advanced by any shareholder beyond the amount of the calls actually made as is in conformity with the Companies Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, or the Companies Clauses Consolidation (Scotland) Act, 1845, as the case may be ; and except such interest (if any) as the Committee on the Bill may, according to the circumstances of the case, think fit to allow, subject always to the following conditions :—(1) That the rate of interest allowed by the Committee do not in any case exceed THREE *four* per centum per annum ; (2) That interest be allowed to be paid in respect only of the time allowed by the Bill for the completion of the railway, or such less time as the Committee think fit ; (3) That payment of interest be not allowed to begin until the Railway Company have deposited with the Board of Trade a statutory declaration by two of the directors and the secretary of the company to the effect that two-thirds at least of the share capital authorised by the Bill, in respect whereof interest may be paid, have been actually issued and accepted, and are held by shareholders, who, or whose executors, administrators, successors, ro assigns, are legally liable for the same ; (4) That interest do not accrue in favour of any shareholder for any time during which any call on any of his shares is in arrear ; (5) That the aggregate amount to be so paid for interest be estimated and stated in the Bill, and be not deemed capital within Standing Order 112 ; (6) That notice of the company having power so to pay interest out of capital be given in every prospectus, advertisement, or other document of the company inviting subscriptions for shares, and in every certificate of shares ; and (7) That the half-yearly accounts of the company do show the amount on which, and the rate at which, interest has been paid. And the company may be authorised by the Bill to pay interest accordingly, but not further or otherwise.—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Municipal Representation Bill. [H.L.].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Courtney of Penwith 731

Second Reading (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Monday next.

Army (Annual) Bill. [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) 732

Moved. " That the Bill be now read 2*a*."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Bill read 2a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before five o'clock, till to-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 16TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 732

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Land Drainage Bill, Provisional Order (No. 1) Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 733

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 733

London County Council (Money) Bill.—"To regulate the expenditure of money by the London County Council on capital account during the current financial period and the raising of money to meet such expenditure; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 733

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—Order [8th April] that the Petition for Additional Provision in the case of the Watford and Edgware Railway Bill be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Brivate Bills read, and discharged. Petition for additional Provision withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 733

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the working of mines and minerals under and adjacent to the portion of the Bridgewater Canal extending from Monton Bridge, in the County of Lancaster, to Leigh in the same county; and for other purposes." [Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to dissolve the Humber Conservancy Commissioners and the Humber Pilotage Commissioners and to incorporate the Humber Conservancy Board; and to confer upon that Board the powerso of the Humber Conservancy Commissioners and of the Humber Pilotage Commissioners, certain powers of the Hull Trinity House, the power to levy dues, and other powers; and for other purposes." [Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for an increase of the share capital of Borax Consolidated, Limited, and for the conversion of the ordinary shares of the company into preferred ordinary shares and deferred ordinary shares; and for other purposes." [Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords.]

Apr. 16.] *Page*

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the time for the completion of the authorised pier and works of the Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Company; and for other purposes." [Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to rearrange and increase the capital of, and to alter and extend the Memorandum of Association, and the objects and powers of the Staveley Coal and Iron Company, Limited; and for other purposes." [Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to vary the style or qualification of Licentiates of the Society of Apothecaries of London; and for other purposes." [Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords.]

And, also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Alderman, and Citizens of the City of Manchester with reference to the constructions of Tramways and street widenings; and for other purposes." [Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill. [Lords] .. 733

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords]; Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]; Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways [Lords.]—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 734

PETITIONS.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Granville; Resolven; and, Westleigh Collieries; to lie upon the Table 735

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 735

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions against: From Aberdeen (two); Arbroath; Buteshire; Hawick; Midlothian; Moray and Nairn; and, Orkney; to lie upon the Table 735

Infant Life Protection Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 735

Limited Partnerships Bill.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 735

Liquor Traffic Local Option (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions against: From Aberdeen (two); Dalkeith; Dundee; Hawick; and, Perth; to lie upon the Table 735

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen; Arbroath; Baltasound; Banff (two); Bonnyrigg; Bothwell; Buckhaven; Coldstream; Cranstonhill; Edinburgh (thirteen); Galashiels; Glasgow (three); Grand Lodge of Scotland of the International Order of Good Templars; Greenock; Inverness (two); Inverurie; Johnshaven; Kilbrachan; Laurencekirk; Longhope; Macduff; Morningside (two); Neilston; Park and Polworth; Rothesay; Saltcoats; Selkirk; Stevenston; and, Troon; to lie upon the Table 735

Apr. 16.] *Page*

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Castle Ward, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 736

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Stockingford, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 736

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 26th March, 1907, approving a Memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in regard to the pay of men of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve who have qualified in Signalling or Wireless Telegraphy [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 736

ARMY (COMMISSIONS).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 27th March; *Mr. Pirie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 111.] 736

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the period from 1st November, 1903 to 31st December, 1905, Vol. I., Part 1, [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 736

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.—Return ordered, " relating to Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 256, of Session 1906.)"—(*Mr. J. A. Pease*) 736

CLYDE PORTS (VESSELS ENTERING, ETC.).—Return ordered, " of the Vessels which entered and cleared the Clyde Ports, Ardrossan, Ayr, Belfast, Liverpool, and Manchester, for the Ports of Germany, Holland, Denmark, and all Ports of the Baltic, East of the Skaw during the year 1906, both Vessels trading direct and vessels trading viâ United Kingdom Ports in the following form :—

Vessels trading direct.

Ports.	Ships entering from the Ports of						Ships clearing to the Ports of					
	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.
Glasgow (Clyde Ports)...												
Ardrossan												
Ayr												
Belfast												
Liverpool...												
Manchester												

Page

Vessels trading viâ United Kingdom Ports.

Ports.	Ships entering from the Ports of							Ships clearing to the Ports of						
	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.	Viâ.	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.	Viâ.
Glasgow (Clyde Ports) ...														
Ardrossan														
Ayr														
Belfast														
Liverpool...														
Manchester														

(*Mr. Ainsworth*) 736

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POPULATION OF IRELAND AND SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 737

PAY AND POSITION OF PLUMBERS IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 739

COMPTROLLERS AND AUDITORS-GENERAL—PENSIONS AND HONOURS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 740

PROMOTION TO SECOND DIVISION CLERKS OF ABSTRACTORS—ASSISTANT CLERKS. —Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 740

GOVERNMENT AUDIT OF IRISH PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 740

SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY IN IRISH GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 741

PROMOTION OF ASSISTANT CLERKS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Runciman 742

IRISH TAX REVENUE.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 743

POSITION OF THORNLEY SUB-POSTMAN AND SUNDERLAND-POLDON RURAL POSTMAN.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 743

DUTY IN AUSTRALIA ON TRADE CALALOGUES.—Question, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 744

Apr. 16.] *Page*

CURRENCY OF BRITISH POSTAL ORDERS IN AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND AND CANADA.—Question. Mr. L. Haslam ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 745

APPLICATION FOR LOANS BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Brodie (Surrey, Reigate) ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 745

USE OF LAND PURCHASED UNDER LOAN BY MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Brodie ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 746

BOARDED-OUT POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Sir G. S. Robertson (Bradford) ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 747

NAVY—CASUALTIES TO SHIPS.—Question, Mr. Hunt ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 747

POLICE IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 747

PAYMENTS TO SEAMEN UNDER ALLOTMENTS NOTES.—Question, Mr. L. Haslam ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 748

COST OF NEW ASYLUM AT NAPSBURY.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 749

DISPOSAL OF SITE OF DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL.—Question, Major Coates (Lewisham) ; Answer, Mr. Harcourt 749

DEDUCTION FROM PROBATE DUTY AND AGRICULTURAL GRANTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 750

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 751

IRISH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—TESTS FOR TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 751

LAVATORY ACCOMMODATION AT KINGSTON BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 752

LODGING ACCOMMODATION AT TIDWORTH FOR OFFICERS' WIVES.—Question, Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 753

GOVERNMENT LICENSING PROPOSALS.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.) ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 753

SPURIOUS SPORTS BILL.—Question, Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock) : Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 754

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

OBSOLETE WAR SHIPS.—Question, Mr. Jenkins (Chatham) ; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 754

PROGRESS OF SHIP CONSTRUCTION.—Questions, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire), Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis) ; Answers, Mr. E. Robertson 755

NAVAL STRENGTH.—Question, Mr. Nuttall (Lancashire ; Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 755

CAVALRY AND GUARDS PROBATIONERS.—Questions, Captain Faber (Hampshire), Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) ; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 756

ARMY ECONOMIES.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 756

WAR STORES AND AMMUNITION.—Question, Mr. Courthope ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 757

WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Question, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 757

COMILLIA RIOTS.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.) ; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 757

PUNJAB LAND ALIENATION BILL.—Question, Mr. O'Grady ; Answer, Mr. Morley 759

BRITISH EAST AFRICA POLICE.—Questions, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone), Mr. C. Wason (Orkney and Shetland) ; Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester) 760

POPULATION OF EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.—Questions, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth), Viscount Turnour ; Answers, Mr. Churchill 761

MACEDONIAN BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) ; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland) 762

DEATHS BY VIOLENCE IN MACEDONIA.—Question, Mr. Lynch ; Answer, Sir E. Grey 762

KHARTOUM LANDS AND SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside) ; Answer, Sir E. Grey 763

SIAMESE CESSIONS TO FRANCE.—Question, Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central) ; Answer, Sir E. Grey 764

HAMBURG STRIKE.—Question, Mr. James Parker (Halifax) ; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 764

HONDURAS POLICE.—Questions, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanark, N.W.), Sir Gilbert Parker ; Answers, Sir Edward Grey 765

PERSIA—THE TUFANGCHARRI TAX.—Questions, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson ; Answer, Sir E. Grey 766

OPIUM PRODUCTION IN CHINA.—Questions, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington), Mr. Lynch, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) ; Answers, Sir Edward Grey .. 766

GOVERNMENT PAINT FACTORIES.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth) ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 767

Apr. 16] Page

ALCESTER VACCINATION CASE.—Questions, Mr. Lupton, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 768

SLATE QUARRY FATALITIES.—Question, Mr. E. Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion), Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 768

CRIME IN YORK.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Newry); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 769

AGRARIAN CRIME IN YORKSHIRE.—Questions, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Captain Craig (Down, E.), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. J. MacVeagh 770

DEATH CERTIFICATES IN THE SHARDLOW UNION.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board, Mr. John Burns (Battersea) 771

POOR LAW—REMOVAL OF AGED SICK.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. J. Burns 771

LODGERS' LETTERS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon; Answer, The Postmaster-General, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 772

TRAMS AND MAIL CARRIAGES.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 772

HAWKHURST POSTMAN'S GRIEVANCE.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 773

NEW ZEALAND MAILS.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 773

SCOTTISH WHALING STATIONS.—Question, Mr. Starkey (Nottinghamshire, Newark); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland, Mr. Sinclair (Forfarshire) .. 773

CONSTABLE O'HALLORAN, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Birrell (Bristol, N.) 774

LOUGHREA COMPENSATION APPEALS AT GALWAY ASSIZES.—Question, Captain Faber (Hant, Andover); Answer, Mr. Birrell 774

INTIMIDATION IN ROSCOMMON.—Question, Captain Faber, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Birrell 775

IRISH UNIVERSITY BILL.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 776

DRUMSNA EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Thomas F. Smyth (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 777

CATTAN EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Thomas F. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Birrell 777

CORDUFF AND FINNALAUGHTA EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. T. F. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Birrell 777

RATES FOR IRISH EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Birrell 778

CATHOLICS AND IRISH GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENT.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 779

STANDING COMMITTEES—EFFECT OF NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire); Answer, Mr. Speaker 779

NEW BILL.

Home Work Bill.—"To provide for the better regulation of Home industries," presented by Mr. Barnes; supported by Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Alexander Wilkie, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Charles Duncan, Mr. Summerbell, Mr. James Parker, and Mr. Steadman; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 158.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [15th April] to Question [20th March], as amended, "(1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to—(*a*) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills; or (*b*) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall without further debate put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, '(*c*) Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom. (*d*) Bills to give effect to treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements. (*e*) Bills to sanction the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown.'"—(*Mr. Stuart Wortley.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Captain Craig (*Down, E.*) 781
Viscount Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 783

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, after the word 'Kingdom,' to insert the words 'or Bills which the promoters declare are intended to lead up to a subordinate Legislature in any part of the United Kingdom.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 784
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) .. 784
Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) .. 785
The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Sir Henry Fowler, Wolverhampton, E.) .. 786
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) .. 787
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) .. 789
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) .. 791
Sir Arthur Bignold (Wicks Burghs) .. 793
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) .. 793
Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall) .. 794
Sir Francis Lowe (Birmingham, Edgbaston) .. 794
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) .. 795
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) .. 796

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 108 ; Noes, 329. (Division List No. 121.)

Question again proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir William Anson (Oxford University) .. 801
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. 806
Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 809
Mr. Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid) .. 811
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) .. 812
Sir Henry Fowler .. 814

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 113 ; Noes, 353. (Division List No. 122.)

Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) .. 819
Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn) .. 821

Amendment proposed—

" In line 10, at the end, to insert the words ' (*c*) or Bills affecting the constitution of any of the Colonies or their relations with this country.' "—(*Sir Gilbert Parker.*)

Question proposed, " That these words be there inserted."

Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) .. 822
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) .. 823

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word ' their,' to insert the words ' civil or military.' "—(*Major Seely.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square) .. 823

Mr. Dalziel .. 824
Viscount Helmsley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Thirsk*) .. 825
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 826

Proposed words there inserted in the proposed Amendment.

Question put, " That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The House divided :—Ayes, 112 ; Noes, 327. (Division List No. 123.)

Earl Percy .. 831

Amendment proposed—

" In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, ' (*c*) or Bills affecting the Government and administration of India.' "—(*Earl Percy.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir Henry Fowler .. 832

Question put, and negatived.

Sir E. Carson .. 832

Amendment proposed—

" In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, ' Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order, a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House.' "—(*Sir E. Carson.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) .. 835
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 838
Sir Henry Fowler .. 840
Mr. Lyttelton .. 842
Mr. Evans .. 844
Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 846
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) .. 846

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

London Port and Docks Bill (BY ORDER).—Second Reading deferred without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 15th April, till Monday, 22nd April, at a quarter past Eight o'clock.

Apr. 16.] *Page*

Business of the House (Procedure).

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question. "(1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to (*a*) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills; or (*b*) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall without further debate put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order, a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House,'" resumed.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 848
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 849
Mr. Wm. Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 850

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 83; Noes, 290. (Division List No. 124.)

Mr. Fell (*Great Yarmouth*) 855

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Bills referred to in His Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne at the commencement of the session."—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. McKenna 855
Viscount Helmsley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Thirsk*) 856

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 76; Noes, 279;. (Division List No. 125.)

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, at the beginning, to insert the words 'Provided that.'" —(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 861
Mr. McKenna 862
Sir William Anson 863
Sir Henry Fowler 863
Mr. Forster (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) 864
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 865
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 865

Question put, and agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury 866
Mr. Charles C. Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 868

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'House,' to insert the words 'until the end of the Session of 1908.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 868

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided :—Ayes, 117 ; Noes, 361. (Division List No. 126.)

And, it being after Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 15th April, proceeded to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments and Motions moved by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendments—

"In line 13, after the word 'provisions,' to insert the words 'and that ;'"

"In line 17, at the end, to add the words, '(3) Where a Bill has been committed to a Standing Committee, or has been so committed in respect of any provision, then, at the Report stage of the Bill or provision, the rule against speaking more than once shall not apply to the Member in charge of the Bill or to the mover of any Amendment or new Clause in respect of that Amendment or Clause.'"—made.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 359 ; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 127.)

Motion made, and Question put, "That this Order be a Standing Order of the House."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 350 ; Noes, 122. (Division List, No. 128.)

Apr. 16.] *Page*

Standing Order 46 read as follows :—The Resolutions of the House of the 1st December, 1882, relating to the constitution and proceedings of Standing Committees for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, and to Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, shall be revived, and Trade shall include Agriculture and Fishing.

Motion made, and Question put, " That the Standing Order be repealed."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 387 ; Noes, 123. (Division List No, 129.)

Standing Order 47 read as follows :—Two Standing Committees shall be appointed for the consideration of all Bills relating to Law and Courts of Justice and Legal Procedure, and to Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, which may by Order of the House in each case, be committed to them ; and the procedure in such Committees shall be the same as in a Select Committee, unless the House shall otherwise order : provided that strangers shall be admitted, except when the Committee shall order them to withdraw ; and the said Committees shall not sit, after Three of the Clock, whilst the House is sitting, without the Order of the House ; provided also, that any notice of Amendment to any clause in a Bill which may be committed to a Standing Committee, given by any hon. Member in the House, shall stand referred to such Committee : provided also, that Twenty be the quorum of such Standing Committees.

Amendment proposed—

" In line 1, to leave out the word ' Two ' and insert the word ' Four.' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, " That the word ' Two ' stand part of the Standing Order."

The House divided :—Ayes, 121 ; Noes, 350. (Division List No. 130.)

Question put, " That the word ' Four ' be there inserted."

The House divided :—Ayes, 336 ; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 131.)

Amendment—

" In line 2, to leave out from the word ' Bills ' to the word ' committed ' in line 4 ' "—made.

Another Amendment proposed—

" In line 7, to leave out the words ' after Three of the Clock.' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Standing Order."

The House divided :—Ayes, 119 ; Noes, 385. (Division List No. 132.)

Another Amendment proposed—

> "In line 8, after the word 'sitting,' to insert the words 'except in pursuance of a Resolution of the Committee, moved by the Member in charge of the Bill before the Committee, and decided without Amendment or debate, and shall not sit after four p.m.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 374; Noes, 118. (Division List No. 133.)

Another Amendment proposed—

> "In line 12, at the end, to add the words 'One of the Standing Committees shall be appointed for the consideration of all Public Bills relating exclusively to Scotland and committed to a Standing Committee, and shall consist of all the Members representing Scottish constituencies, together with not more than fifteen other Members to be nominated in respect of any Bill by the Committee of Selection, who shall have regard in such nomination to the approximation of the balance of Parties in the Committee to that in the Whole House, and shall have power from time to time to discharge, for non-attendance or at their own request, the Members so nominated by them, and to appoint others in substitution for those discharged. Subject as aforesaid the Bills committed to a Standing Committee shall be distributed among the Committees by Mr. Speaker. In all but one of the Standing Committees Government Bills shall have precedence. Standing Order 19 (as to irrelevance and repetition) and Standing Orders 26 and 27 (as to closure) shall apply to Standing Committees, with the substitution in Standing Order 26 of the Chairman of the Committee for the Chairman of Ways and Means, and, in Standing Order 27 of 20 for 100 as the number necessary to render the majority effective for the Closure, and the Chairman of a Standing Committee shall have the like powers as the Chairman of a Committee of the Whole House has under Standing Order 23 (as to dilatory motions).'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House divided:—Ayes, 363; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 134.)

Standing Order 48 read as follows:—Each of the said Standing Committees shall consist of not less than sixty nor more than eighty Members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection, who shall have regard to the classes of Bills committed to such Committees, to the composition of the House, and to the qualifications of the Members selected; and shall have power to discharge Members from time to time, and to appoint others in substitution for those discharged. The Committee of Selection shall also have power to add not more than fifteen Members to a Standing Committee in respect of any Bill referred to it, to serve on the Committee during consideration of such Bill.

Amendment—

> "In line 6, after the word 'time,' to insert 'for non-attendance or at their own request'"—made.

Apr. 17.] *Page*

Another Amendment proposed—

> "In line 6, after the word 'discharged,' to insert the words, 'provided that, for the consideration of all Public Bills relating exclusively to Wales and Monmouthshire, the Committee shall be so constituted as to comprise all Members sitting for constituencies in Wales and Monmouthshire.' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided: Ayes, 351; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 135.)

Amendment—

> "At end, to add 'Provided that this Order shall not apply to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.' "—made.

Standing Order 49 read as follows:—The Committee of Selection shall nominate a Chairmen's Panel to consist of not less than four nor more than six Members, of whom three shall be a quorum; and the Chairmen's Panel shall appoint from among themselves the Chairman of each Standing Committee, and may change the Chairman so appointed from time to time.

Amendment—

> "To leave out 'six' and insert 'eight.' "—made.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday evening, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 17TH APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Llandrindod Wells Gas; Bude Gas; Falmouth Gas; Annfield Plain and District Gas; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions); Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited [H.L.];

The same were ordered to lie on the Table. 921

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next 921

Page

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited Bill. [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order) 921

Electric Supply Corporation Bill. [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read, and discharged 921

Tyne Improvement Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª. An Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 921

Oxford and District Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª and passed, and sent to the Commons 921

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill. [H.L.]—The Order made on the 18th of March last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged 921

Glasgow Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Clinton be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Faber; read, and agreed to 921

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provision al Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the London County Council to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts. Was presented by the Lord President (*E. Crewe*) read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 31) 922

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill, [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

**The Lord President of the Council* (*The Earl of Crewe*) 922

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Earl of Crewe*).

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order) and committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT, No. 2. (1907.)—Despatch from the Earl of Cromer respecting the water supply of Egypt 923

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3763. France: (Trade and agriculture of French West Africa for 1905–1906) 923

No. 3764. France: (Réunion).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. . 923

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.—University Court Ordinance, No. XIX. (Glasgow, No. 5). Foundation of James S. Dixon Chair of Mining: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 29) 923

Apr. 17.] Page

CROFTING PARISHES (SCOTLAND).—Return respecting: Laid before the House (pursuant to order of the 18th of March last), and to be printed. (No. 30) .. 923

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.—The Lord Balfour appointed to take the chair in Committees of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees 923

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 923

Moved, That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for a complete list, with dates of issue, of the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and of the appendices thereto; together with an alphabetical index of the collections examined and reported on, giving a Reference to the Report and appendix wherein the result of the examination may be found.—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Earl Beauchamp 924

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

THE SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.

Lord Brassey 924
Lord Ellenborough 928
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 930
Earl Cawdor 934

Army (Annual) Bill.

House in Committee (according to Order.)

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) 935

Bill passed through Committee, and reported to the House without Amendment.

Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 935

Moved, "That the House do adjourn until Monday next except for judicial business."—(*The Marquess of Ripon.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 17TH APRIL, 1907

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 936

Swansea Harbour Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 936

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP E).—MR. MOONEY reported from the Committee on Group E of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned until Friday, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 936

Taff Vale Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).—Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday, the 30th April, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 937

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 937

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled "An Act to confer further powers upon the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Devonport with reference to their water undertaking and their electrical undertaking; to make further and better provision with regard to the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the said borough; and for other purposes." [Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Company and to transfer to the Company the powers of the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Order, 1906; to authorise the Barry Railway Company to subscribe to the capital of the Company; and for other purposes." [Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the county borough of Middlesbrough to construct a transporter bridge across the River Tees and to discontinue the Middlesbrough and Port Clarence Ferry; and for other purposes." [Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the time for the sale of certain lands reclaimed by the Tees Conservancy Commissioners; to enable the Commissioners to establish a superannuation fund; and for other purposes." [Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords.] 937

Apr. 17.] *Page*

Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords]; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 938

PETITIONS.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Darwen; and Radford; to lie upon the Table 938

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Kilmarnock, against; to lie upon the Table 938

Licensing Acts.—Petition from Eccles, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table 938

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions against: From Dundee; and Hamilton; to lie upon the Table 938

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Cambuslang (two); Coupar Angus (two); Dunnet; Eastwood; Edinburgh; Glasgow (three); Grangemouth (two); Huntley (two); Insch; Largo; Lochee; Musselburg; Oban; Partick; Pollokshaws; Stanhousemuir; and Thornliebank; to lie upon the Table 938

Merchandise Marks Bill.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 938

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Egypt (No. 2, 1907).—Copy presented, of Despatch from the Earl of Cromer respecting the Water Supply of Egypt [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 938

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports (Annual Series) Nos. 3763 and 3764 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 938

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance).—Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance, No. XIX. (Glasgow, No. 5) (Foundation of James S. Dixon Chair of Mining) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 112.] 939

Tramways and Light Railways (Street and Road).—Return ordered, "Of Street and Road Tramways and Light Railways authorised by Act or Order, showing the amount of capital authorised, paid up, and expended, the length of line authorised, and the length open for public traffic down to the 31st day of December, 1906, in respect of companies, and the 31st day of March, 1907, in respect of local authorities; the gross receipts, working expenditure, net receipts, and appropriation of net receipts; the number of passengers conveyed, the number of miles run by cars, and the quantity of electrical energy used during the year ended on the foregoing dates respectively; together with the number of horses, engines, and cars at those dates (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 298, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*) 939

Apr. 17.]

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

COST OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 940

INSPECTORS AND THE LABOURER'S ACT, 1906; —Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 941

RATEABLE VALUATION OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 942

EXCHEQUER BONDS.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs); Answer, Mr. Asquith 942

EMPLOYMENT OF SOLDIERS BY THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Clynes (Manchester, N.E.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 943

QUALIFICATION OF IRISH OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 945

IRISH CHANCERY COURT APPOINTMENTS—PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, Mr. Birrell 946

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PUBLIC CARRIAGE DEPARTMENT AND THE CROYDON TRAMWAY FATALITY.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 947

STRUCTURAL AND SANITARY IMPROVEMENTS TO PROVIDED SCHOOLS—SPREADING COST OVER A PERIOD OF YEARS.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. John Burns.. 948

SUPPLY OF MILK IN WORKHOUSES—PRECAUTIONS AGAINST TUBERCULOSIS.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, Mr. John Burns 948

APPLICATIONS FOR POOR LAW RELIEF—CASE OF MRS. GOULD OF BIRMINGHAM.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 949

WORKING OF THE UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.—Question, Mr. O'Grady; Answer, Mr. John Burns 949

PAYMENT OF PUBLIC VACCINATORS.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) Answer, Mr. John Burns.. 950

TUBERCULOSIS—NOTIFICATION OF DISEASE IN COWS.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 950

TENANT FARMERS AND THE PRESERVATION OF GAME.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey.. 951

AMERICAN GOOSEBERRY MILDEW.—Question, Mr. Beck (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 951

SCOTTISH MARRIAGE LAWS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw 952

SUPERANNUATION PRIVILEGES OF EXTRACTORS' DEPARTMENT, COURT OF SESSION.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw 953

Apr. 17.] *Page*

ASSESSMENT IN STIRLINGSHIRE FOR REPAIRS TO ESTABLISHED CHURCH MANSE.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 953

ENFORCING OF CUSTOMS ACT, 1842.—Question, Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton); Answer, Mr. Asquith 954

TRIBAL FIGHTING NEAR JAMAICA.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 954

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Sir Charles Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley 954

CONVEYANCE OF LOCAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WEST INDIAN ISLANDS.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 955

ANNUAL LEAVE—TRAVELLING AND OTHER ALLOWANCES OF THE CLERICAL STAFF OF THE ADMIRALTY SUPPLY AND ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 956

IRISH JURORS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Cherry 961

BOROUGH COUNCILS AND MOUNTED POLICE.—Question, Mr. Seddon; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 961

VENTILATION OF LOBBIES.—Question, Sir B. Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 962

ARMOUR AND COMPANY AND ARMY MEAT CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Haldane 962

MEN EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT ORDNANCE FACTORIES AND AT WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Question, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars), Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford); Answer, Mr. Haldane 967

DISBANDING OF ROYAL ENGINEERS (MILITIA) SUBMARINE MINERS.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Haldane 971

TERRITORIAL ARMY—PHYSICAL FITNESS OF MEN.—Question, Mr. Balcarres; Answer, Mr. Haldane 971

CLOSING OF COASTGUARD STATIONS—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 971

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL MANNING.—Question, Mr. Murray Macdonald (Falkirk Burghs); Answer, The Secretary of the Admiralty, (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. 972

NUCLEUS CREWS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 972

GERMAN AND FRENCH NAVAL SHIPBUILDING.—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex Horsham); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 973

TONNAGE OF NEW BATTLESHIPS.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 973

Page

Northern Nigeria—Railway Schemes.—Questions, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe), Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.), Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Burghs); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 974

Colonial Coastal Trade.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Churchill 975

Coloured Policeman in Crown Dependencies.—Questions, Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. Churchill 975

Poll Tax on Immigrants.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 976

Alexandra Palace Betting Case.—Questions, Mr. Waterlow (Islington, N.), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 976

Scottish Emigrants.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 977

Hamburg Dock Strike.—Questions, Viscount Turnour, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 979

Imperial Navigation Conference.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 980

Ladylower (Derbyshire) School.—Question, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 980

Llanychan School.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 981

Education Code.—Question, Sir Francis Powell (Wigan); Answer, Mr. McKenna 981

Royston Headmastership.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, Mr. McKenna 982

The Chantry Trust.—Questions, Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.), Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 982

Sandford Wills Estate, Queen's County.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Qeuen's County, Leix); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 985

Irish Land Purchase—Inspection of Estates.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 985

Suggested Committee of Financial Experts.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 985

Uneconomic Holdings as Security for Advance.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 980

Barnmeen (County Down) School.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 987

Apr. 17.] *Page*

UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLY AT ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 989

ALLEGED DYNAMITE OUTRAGE AT CLOGHROE.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 990

AGRARIAN OUTRAGE IN KING'S COUNTY.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore), Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr); Answers, Mr. Birrell 990

ARDAGH POLICE HUT.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 992

ST. PATRICK'S CELEBRATION AT ARMAGH.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Birrell 992

MR. FINUCANE AND THE PROTECTION OF PLANTERS.—Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell 993

ELGHIN DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Captain Craig, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Birrell 993

LEITRIM POLICE BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 994

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.), Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 995

BARON DE ROBECK'S COUNTY DUBLIN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 997

NORTH DUBLIN COUNCIL, LABOURERS COTTAGE ADVANCES.—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 998

MAYO—INSPECTION OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Gwynn (Galway); Answer, Mr. Birrell 998

STROKESTOWN UNION—LABOURERS' COTTAGES.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 999

O'ROURKE ESTATE—TURBARY PETITION.—Question, Mr. Thomas F. Smyth (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 999

GLEN BOAT COVE SLIP.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1000

IRISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—VETERINARY STAFF.—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1000

IRISH OFFICIALS—PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Birrell 1001

DOOHOOMA NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1002

DROMINA EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1002

Apr. 17.] *Page*

MUNIGLUGH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 1003

BELFAST POLICE—MEDICAL STAFF.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1004

IRISH POLICE DEPOT ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 1005

COUNTY MAGISTRACY.—Questions, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford), Mr. Stanley Wilson (York, E.R., Holderness), Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Mr. Bridgeman; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) .. 1005

IMPERIAL DEFENCE—MEDITERRANEAN STATIONS.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1007

STANDING ORDERS.—Ordered, That the Standing Orders, as amended, be printed. [No. 113] 1007

Irish Tobacco Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 114.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 114.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 159] 1007

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)—Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing,) Shipping, and Manufactures: Sir Edward Strachey and Mr. Lloyd-George; and had appointed in substitution; Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill; Mr. Glover, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. William Johnson, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Cochrane, Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Lambton, Mr. John Hope, Mr. William Edwin Harvey, Mr. Billson, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. Raphael, and Mr. Cory.

Reports to lie upon the Table 1008

NEW BILLS.

Shop Clubs Act (1902) Amendment Bill.—"To extend the provisions of Section 1 of the Shop Clubs Act, 1902, to membership of the trades unions and industrial and provident societies," presented by Mr. John Ward; supported by Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. Brace, Mr. Maddison, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Steadman; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 160] 1008

Apr. 17.] *Page*

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.

* *The Attorney-General* (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) 1008

Motion made, and Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to establish a Court of Criminal Appeal, and to amend the Law relating to Appeals in Criminal Cases"—put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. Secretary Gladstone.

Criminal Appeal Bill.—"To establish a Court of Criminal Appeal, and to amend the Law relating to Appeals in Criminal Cases," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 161.].

Patents and Designs Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir F. Cawley (*Lancashire, Prestwich*) 1012
Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) 1016
Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 1020
Sir F. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 1021
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 1025
Mr. Mond (*Chester*) 1027
Mr. J. D. White (*Dumbartonshire*) 1030
Mr. Jesse Collings (*Birmingham, Bordesley*) 1035
Mr. Astbury (*Lancashire, Southport*) 1037
Mr. Meysey-Thompson (*Staffordshire, Handsworth*) 1041
The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1042
Mr. Bonar Law (*Camberwell, Dulwich*) 1047
The Solicitor-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 1051
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1053
Mr. Radford (*Islington, E.*) 1053
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 1055

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

Butter and Margarine Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

The Treasurer of the Household (*Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.*) .. 1056

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Flynn (*Cork, N.*) 1062
Mr. Lundon (*Limerick, E.*) 1063

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, Further Proceding was postponed without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 4.

ADMIRALTY ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. Bellairs (*Lynn Regis*) 1066
Mr. F. E. Smith (*Liverpool, Walton*) 1075

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House, while recognising the services rendered by the Admiralty, regrets to observe evidence of ill-considered changes vitally affecting the war readiness of the Navy; the House is of opinion that its control over the Navy in recent years has been, and is being, weakened by the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty from the House of Commons, by undue secrecy, by sudden changes of policy, and by Admiralty officials resorting to novel methods for the purpose of influencing public opinion."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*)

The Secretary to the Admiralty (*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee*) .. 1085
Mr. Arthur Lee (*Hants, Fareham*) 1092
Mr. Jenkins (*Chatham*) 1095
Captain Hervey (*Bury St. Edmunds*) 1096

Leave to withdraw being refused,

Question put, and negatived.

Hours of Labour (Bakehouse) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 1100
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 1100

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 18TH APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Metropolitan Police Provisional Order.

Also the Certificates that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill: Marriages Provisional Order.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders have not keen complied with in respect of the petitions for additional provision in the following Bills : Midland Railway [H.L.] ; Coventry Corporation Water [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1101

COVENTRY CORPORATION WATER BILL [H.L.] PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) ; Midland Railway Bill [H.L.] (Petition for Additional Provision). Examiners' Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next 1101

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Memorandum on the teaching of arithmetic in primary schools : Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1101

House adjourned at a quarter past Three o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : THURSDAY, 18TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITIONS FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. : Great Central Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 1101

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1102

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1102

Boston Spa Gas Bill ; Shanklin Gas Bill ; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments ; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1102

North East London Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended] ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1102

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended] ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1102

Apr. 18.] *Page*

West Riding Tramways Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1102

Medway Lower Navigation Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 1102

Royal Insurance Company Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 1102

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill.—Reported with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1102

North Eastern and Lancashire and Yorkshire Railways Bill.—Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. 1102

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).—Sir LEWIS M'IVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1103

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Chorley; and Mountain Ash; to lie upon the Table 1103

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition of the United Free Church of Scotland, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1103

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1103

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition against: From Aberdeen; Dumfries; Edinburgh; Inverness; Kelso; and Kirkcaldy; to lie upon the Table 1103

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Aberdeenshire; Crief; Dunoon; Hamilton; Kelso; Kilmarnock; Kirkcaldy; and Peterhead; to lie upon the Table 1103

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Aberdeen (three); Annan; Bathgate; Birsay; Buckie; Dundee; Eaglesfield; Ellon; Glasgow (two); Greenock (three); Inverness; Kingussie; Lesmahagow; Melrose; Motherwell; Paisley (two); Perth; Petercoulter; Stonehaven; Stromness; and Torry; to lie upon the Table 1103

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (NO. 2) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1103

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1104

Apr. 18.] *Page*

RIGHTS OF WAY (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1104

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petitions for prohibition: From Bournemouth; and Hinckley; to lie upon the Table.. 1104

SCHOOL BOARDS CONFERENCE (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table 1104

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Memorandum on the teaching of arithmetic in primary schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1104

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Order with respect to the Urban County District of Cookstown [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.. 1104

JAMAICA.—Copy presented, of correspondence relating to the resignation of Sir A. Swettenham of his office as Governor of Jamaica [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1104

FINANCIAL STATEMENT (1907–8).—Copy ordered, "of Statement of Revenue and Expenditure as laid before the House by the Chancellor of the Exchequer when opening the Budget."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Copy presented acordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 115] 1104

EAST INDIA (EXCISE COMMITTEE).—Address for "Return of Orders of the Government of India on Chapters II. and IX. of the Report of the Excise Committee, 1905–6."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts*) 1104

SANITARY OFFICERS IN RURAL DISTRICTS.—Return ordered, "of the medical Officers of Health and Inspectors of Nuisances in the Rural Districts of each county in England and Wales, showing the area and population of each district, and, as regards each officer, the amount of his remuneration, whether repayment is made in respect of it by the county council, and whether it holds any other appointment or carries on any other occupation."—(*Sir John Dickson-Poynder*) 1105

INTER-IMPERIAL TRADE.—Return ordered, "showing, for the last year for which figures are available:—(*a*) the value of all articles imported into the United Kingdom from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and British South Africa, respectively, (i.) free of duty; (ii.) subject to duty; (*b*) the value of all articles imported into Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and British South Africa, respectively, from the United Kingdom, (i.) free of duty; (ii.) subject to duty."—(*Mr. Harold Cox*) 1105

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Accounts ordered, "of Receipts and Expenditure, with Balance Sheet, for each year 1900 to 1906."—(*Mr. Runciman*) 1105

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POSTMEN'S PROMOTION.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1105

Apr. 18.] *Page*

DUBLIN ASSISTANT POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1105

SLIGO—LAND APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1106

IRISH URBAN RATING LAW.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1108

BELFAST POST OFFICE TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1108

WEST INDIAN MAIL SUBSIDIES.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1109

CAVAN POSTAL ARRANGEMENT.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1109

ANTRIM POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1109

INDIAN RAILWAY INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs); Answer, Mr. Morley 1110

CASTLETOWN BERE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1110

BALLINGEARY ASSAULT CASE.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1112

KILFINANE TOWN TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1112

COACHFORD EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1113

COOLROE ESTATE, WEXFORD.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1114

WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Question, Sir Berkeley, Sheffield (Lancashire Brigg); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1114

COLONIAL PREMIERS AND THE RESERVE FORCE.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1114

GUN VELOCITIES.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1115

TIDWORTH BARRACKS HOSPITAL.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1115

NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1115

NENAGH GARRISON.—Question, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1115

ARMY SCHEME—COUNTY ASSOCIATIONS.—Question, Captain Hervey (Bury St. Edmunds); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1116

Apr. 18.] *Page*

PAY OF LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1117

COST OF AUTUMN MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1117

SECOND DIVISION CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1118

SECOND DIVISION CLERKS' EXAMINATION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1119

ANNUAL LEAVE IN THE EXCHEQUER OF AUDIT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1119

CODE TELEGRAMS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1120

ADDRESSES OF PRIVATE TELEGRAMS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1120

CENSUS ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Question, Sir A. Spicer (Hackney, Central); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1124

HIS MAJESTY'S CUSTOMS TIDE SURVEYOR —Question, Mr. W. Hope (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1122

SETTLESTON FREE CHURCH PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1122

HANWELL VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1122

PRIVILEGE CABS.—Question, Mr C. B. Harmsworth (Worcestershire, Droitwich); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1123

MUNICIPAL INDEBTEDNESS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer Mr. John Burns 1123

MIDWIFERY.—Question. Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1124

PROPOSED VIZAMGAM—MALIA RAILWAY —Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Morley 1124

BENGAL INDIAN EDUCATION SERVICE.—Question, Mr. McCallum (Paisley); Answer; Mr. Morley 1125

IRISH EDUCATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1126

BUNDORAN EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1126

GLENBOY FAIR RENT CASES.—Question, Mr. Dolan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1126

INSPECTION OF IRISH SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1127

Page

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY CADETS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1127

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1127

UPPER BALLERAGH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1128

CALLUM EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1129

DINGLE HARBOUR BOARD.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1129

NORTHUMBERLAND ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Sir Robert Hobart (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer Mr. Haldane 1130

EXCHEQUER AND AUDIT DEPARTMENT PRESS COMMUNICATION.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1130

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.—Questions, Mr. Jowett (Bradford, W.), Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 1131

HIS MAJESTY'S SHIP "DREADNOUGHT."—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1131

H.M.S. "PHŒNIX."—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1132

THE COASTGUARD.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1132

H.M.S. "FURIOUS"—CASE OF STOKER KEELEY.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1132

ANTI-OPIUM MOVEMENT IN THE MALAY PENINSULA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1133

OPIUM SMOKING IN PENANG.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1134

WHITE POLICE IN BRITISH EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1134

TRANSVAAL GOVERNMENT AND CHINESE COOLIE REPATRIATION.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1134

THE NAIROBI CASE—CAPTAIN GROGAN.—Questions, Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney), Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1135

Apr. 18.]

Page

SIR ALEXANDER SWETTENHAM.—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1137

GERMAN SETTLEMENTS IN THE FAR EAST—SALE OF OPIUM.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1137

BRITISH TRADE IN EASTERN PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Borough); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1137

MESOPOTAMIA OIL CONCESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1138

CONGO FREE STATE—LADO ENCLAVE.—Question, Mr. Field (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1138

EGYPTIAN AGENT-GENERAL.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1138

NEW HEBRIDES.—Questions, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby), Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury), Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answers, Sir Edward Grey 1139

EGYPT—SUGAR ROYALTY ON REFINED SUGAR.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1140

EGYPTIAN PHARMACY LAWS.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1140

CANADIAN TARIFFS—SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S STATEMENT.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1140

METZ SMALLPOX OUTBREAKS.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1141

DUTY ON COCOA.—Question, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) .. 1142

IMPORTED COLONIAL SPIRIT.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1143

DUTY ON TOBACCO.—Question, Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1143

ANTHRAX.—Question, Mr. Jowett; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1144

BIRMINGHAM BETTING PROSECUTION.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1145

ALIENS.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlet, Stepney), Captain Craig (Down, E.), Major Seely; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1145

VACCINATION EXEMPTION AT BRADFORD.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1147

POOR PRISONERS DEFENCE ACT.—Question, Mr. Rendall (Gloucestershire, Thornbury); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1148

COMPANY SUBSCRIPTIONS TO ELECTION FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr, Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1148

COAL EXPORT.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1153

EXPORT RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Austen Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1153

COMMERCIAL CORRUPTION.—Question, Mr. J. M. Henderson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1154

PATENT LAW.—Question, Mr. Mond (Chester); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 1154

NORTH-EASTERN SIGNAL BOXES AT HULL.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1155

EMIGRATION.—Questions, Captain Faber, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea 1155

DERBY UNION AND VACCINATION.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1156

POOR LAW EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1157

DEATH FROM VACCINATION AT HARRINGAY.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1158

INDIAN MAIL CONTRACTS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, The Postmaster-General, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1158

EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1159

ROYSTON HEAD TEACHERSHIP.—Questions, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Mr. George Faber (York); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1159

NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS.—Question, Lord R. Cecil; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 1161

PALL MALL IMPROVEMENT.—Question, Sir F. Banbury (City of London); Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 1161

GRAND COMMITTEE ROOMS.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Harcourt .. 1162

VOTE ON ACCOUNT OF PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 1162

Apr. 18.] Page

Prescot Land Tax Commissioners.—Question, Mr. Austen Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1162

Second Class Inspectors of Inland Revenue.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1163

Population, Revenue and Expenditure.—Question, Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1163

Export of Horses to the Continent.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1164

Anthrax.—Question, Mr. Jowett; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1164

Dumbarton Sewerage.—Question, Mr. R. Duncan (Govan); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1165

British Fishermen on Foreign Trawlers.—Questions, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland), Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness), Sir George Doughty (Great Grimsby); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs), Mr. Sinclair 1165

Irish Board of Works.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1167

Carrickfergus Town Land.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) 1167

Irish Post Office Stores Department.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1168

Welsh Church Commission.—Questions, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Rees; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1169

Irish Licensing Trade.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1169

Loans for School Buildings.—Question, Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1170

Standing Order 18.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1170

Empire Day.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1171

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1171

Indian Budget.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1172

Malta.—Question, Sir F. Banbury (City of London); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1172

The Government and the Lords.—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1172

GRAND COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. Stanley Wilson; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1172

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND THE COLONIAL PREMIERS.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1173

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping and Manufactures: Mr. Everett and Mr. William Johnson; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Lupton and Mr. John Johnson.

Report to lie on the Table 1174

NEW BILLS.

Convicts' Divorce Bill.—"To entitle the wives of convicted persons, sentenced to seven years imprisonment and upwards to Divorce," presented by Mr. Bottomley; to be read a second time upon Friday, 26th April, and to be printed. [Bill 162] 1174

Town Tenants (England and Wales) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Town Tenants in England and Wales; presented by Mr. Walker; supported by Mr. Rendall and Mr. Wedgwood; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 163] 1174

Rights of Way (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill.—"To amend the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, with regard to Rights of Way," presented by Mr. Munro Ferguson; supported by Sir Thomas Glen Coats; to be read a second time upon Monday, 29th April, and to be printed. [Bill 164] .. 1174

Patents and Designs (Consolidation) Bill.—"To consolidate the Enactments relating to Patents for Inventions and the Registration of Designs and certain Enactments relating to Trade Marks," presented by Mr. Kearley; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 165] 1174

Harbour Authorities (Ireland) Bill.—"To fix and regulate the franchise for the election of the members of Harbour Authorities in Ireland," presented by Mr. Joseph Devlin; supported by Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Kettle, Mr. Mooney, Mr. M'Killop, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th May, and to be printed. [Bill 166] 1175

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS).

Ordered, That the Committee of Ways and Means have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*) .. 1175

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS).

Ordered, That the Proceedings of the Committee of Ways and Means, if under consideration at Eleven o'clock this night be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House).—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*) 1175

Apr. 18.] Page

WAYS AND MEANS (COMMITTEE).

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

THE BUDGET STATEMENT.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 1175

TEA.

1. Motion made, and question proposed, "That the Customs duty now charged on tea shall continue to be charged until the first day of July nineteen hundred and eight (that is to say) tea, the pound 5d."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*) .. ..

Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1212
Mr. George Faber (York) 1220
Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) 1224
Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall) 1225
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1226
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1229
Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln) 1231
Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.) 1233
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 1236
Colonel R. Williams (Dorsetshire, W.) 1236
Mr. Scott (Ashton-under-Lyne) 1239
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 1240
Mr. Mandison (Burnley) 1244
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1246
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 1249
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1253

Question put, and agreed to.

CONTINUANCE OF ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS DUTIES ON TOBACCO, BEER AND SPIRITS.

2. Resolved, That the additional Customs duties on tobacco, beer, and spirits imposed by sections two, three, four, and five of The Finance Act, 1900 (including any increased duties imposed by section five of that Act), shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine. —(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

CONTINUANCE OF ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTIES ON BEER AND SPIRITS.—

3. Resolved, That the additional Excise duties on beer and spirits imposed by sections six and seven of the Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

HIRE PURCHASE AGREEMENT.

4. Resolved, That a hire-purchase agreement shall be charged with stamp duty as an agreement, or if under seal or in Scotland with a clause of registration as a deed, as the case requires, and shall not in any case be

exempt from stamp duty as an agreement, letter, or memorandum made for or relating to the sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ESTATE DUTY (FINANCE ACT, 1896, s. 21).

5. Resolved, That the deduction allowed under section twenty-one of The Finance Act, 1896, on account of the previous payment of duty on property shall (instead of being calculated as provided by that section) be taken to be the amount which would be payable on account of the duty on the property if the duty were calculated on the value of the property upon which estate duty is payable.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

PERMANENT ANNUAL CHARGE.

6. Resolved, That the permanent annual charge for the National Debt for the current financial year be twenty-nine and a-half million pounds.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

AMENDMENT OF LAW.

7. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at Five minutes before Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 19TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Read the third time, and passed .. 1257

Neath, Pontardawe and Brynaman Railway Bill.—As amended, considered. An Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 1257

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1257

Apr. 19.] Page

Great Northern and City Railway Bill; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1257

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Ammanford; Burry Port; and, Pentremawr; to lie upon the Table 1257

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From East Lothian; Falkirk; and, Peeblesshire; to lie upon the Table 1257

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Greenock, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1257

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Argyll; Falkirk; Forres; Haddington; Kirkintillock; and, Paisley; to lie upon the Table.. 1257

LIQUOR TRAFFIC ((LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Abbeyhill; Alexandria; Ayr; Ballachulish; Cambuslang; Clydebank (four); Colmonell; Dundee; Edinburgh (six); Glasgow; Greenock; Helensburgh; Johnstone; Kirkcudbright; Longside; Milnathort; Nairn; New Leeds; Savoch; and Tarbert; to lie upon the Table 1257

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.—Petition from Raunds, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1258

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1258

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).—Copy presented, of Licence granted to Thomas Thompson under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853 to 1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1258

POLICE ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's Certificate under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force for the year ended 29th September, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1258

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered, 18th April; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table.. 1258

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PREPARATION OF PARLIAMENTARY RETURNS BY CUSTOMS STATISTICAL OFFICE.—Question, Major Coates (Lewisham); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1258

SALARIES OF STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES—Question, Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1259

Apr. 19.] *Page*

VALUATION OF NEWPORT (MON.) PUBLIC HOUSES—DECISION OF INLAND REVENUE.—Question, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1259

ALLEGED DISSATISFACTION AMONGST IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. T. O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 1260

JAMAICA BANANA TRADE SUBSIDY.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1261

HERRINGS IN THE CLYDE DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Lamont (Buteshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1261

WORKHOUSE DIETARY—SAVING OF BREAD.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1262

DISCOVERIES OF HIDDEN CARTRIDGES.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1263

IRISH TAX REVENUE.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1263

ACCOUNTS OF MR. CLEMENTI'S TOUR.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1263

SALE OF THE WHYTE ESTATE, COUNTY LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1264

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF PATRICK WOODS.—Question, Mr. Thos. F. Smyth (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1264

IRISH EMIGRATION RETURNS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1264

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT GRANTS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1265

TEACHING OF ROMAN CATHOLIC CHILDREN IN IRISH PROTESTANT SCHOOLS.—Question, Captain Craig (Down. E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1266

LOUGH CUTRA NATIONAL SCHOOLS—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1266

TYPHUS OUTBREAK AT OUGHTERARD.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1267

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE AND AERIAL NAVIGATION.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1268

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Sir Walter Richard Nugent, baronet, for the county of Westmeath, South Westmeath Division 1268

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Cochrane; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Akers-Douglas.

Report to lie upon the Table 1269

Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.) 1269
Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.) 1269

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.) 1279
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1284
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 1299
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1304
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 1310
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1318
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1326
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1331

And, it being Five of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. JOHN REDMOND rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 209 ; Noes, 62. (Division List, No. 136.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 208 ; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 137.)

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, " That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 61 ; Noes, 184. (Division List No. 138).

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

Police Superannuation (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

And, it being half-past Five of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at half after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS. MONDAY, 22ND APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas; Basingstoke Gas; Keswick Urban District Council (Water); Maidstone Gas; Hull and Barnsley Railway; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment); Brockenhurst Gas.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1341

Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee 1341

Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.].—Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee, one to produce documents 1341

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 14th and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed 1341

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 25th of February and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed 1341

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.].—Southend Water Bill [H.L.]; Southend-on-Sea Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.]—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl Cathcart be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Scarborough; read, and agreed to 1341

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill; brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 1341

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Calne Valley Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Biddulph be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Seaton; read, and agreed to 1342

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; (No. 32.).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Aston Manor (Extension to Erdington), Chesham (Amendment), Hipperholme (Amendment), Lytham, Newark (Amendment), Penrith (Amendment), Pontefract and Stockport (Amendment): And 1342

Apr. 22.] Page

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; (No. 33).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, containing the schedule of maximum tolls and charges applicable to the New Junction Canal of the Undertakers of the Aire and Calder Navigation—Were presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 1342

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed 1342

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 34.) 1342

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

JAMAICA.—Correspondence relating to the resignation by Sir A. Swettenham of his office as Governor of Jamaica 1342

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, under the Coal Mines Regulation Acts, 1887 to 1896, the Metalliferous Mines Regulation Acts, 1872 and 1875, and the Quarries Act, 1894, for the year 1906; East Scotland District, R. McLaren; West Scotland, J. M. Ronaldson; Newcastle, J. B. Atkinson; Durham, R. Donald Bain; York and Lincoln, W. Walker; Manchester and Ireland, John Gerrard; Liverpool and North Wales, Henry Hall, I.S.O.; Midland, A. H. Stokes; Stafford, Hugh Johnstone, Cardiff and Swansea, W. N. Atkinson, F. A. Gray, and J. Dyer Lewis; Southern, J. S. Martin 1343

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Reports of the Local Education Authority and of His Majesty's Inspector upon the educational fitness of Mr. Milnes for the position of head teacher of the Royston National School.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1343

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Aberdeen to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1905–1906 1343

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Order with respect to the urban county district of Cookstown 1343

POLICE ACT, 1890.—Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's certificate, under Section 18 (2) of the Act, to the River Tyne Police Force, for the year ended 29th September, 1906 1343

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).—Licence granteff by His Majesty to Thomas Thompson under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A. of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864 1343

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (COUNTY OF GLAMORGAN).—Order made by the council of the county of Glamorgan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the Aber Town and Ystrad Mynach wards of the Caerphilly Urban District.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1343

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1344
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) .. 1344

THE APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES.

The Marquess of Bath 1344
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1353
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1360

Army Annual Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed 1364

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE.

Lord Leith of Fyvie 1364

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for any correspondence which has taken place between the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States of America respecting the international celebrations held at Pittsburg, United States of America, in connection with the opening of the Carnegie Institute.—(*Lord Leith of Fyvie.*)

Lord Fitzmaurice 1366

Motion by leave of the House withdrawn.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY 22ND APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz:—Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]; Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords]; Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Middlesborough Corporation Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1368

Page

Apr. 22.]

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the petition for additional provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—Central London Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 1368

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 1368

Medway Lower Navigation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1368

Royal Insurance Company Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1369

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 1369

West Riding Tramways Bill [LORDS] [NOT AMENDED].—Considered ; to be read the third time 1369

Manchester Ship Canal (Various Powers) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1369

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for conferring further powers on the Tyne Improvement Commissioners ; and for amending certain of the Tyne Improvement Acts, 1850 to 1902 ; and for other purposes." [Tyne Improvement Bill [Lords].]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to vest the existing tramways in the City of Oxford in the City of Oxford Electric Tramways, Limited, and to authorise that company to remove and reconstruct the same, and to construct additional tramways in and adjacent to the city ; and for other purposes." [Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords]] 1369

Tyne Improvement Bill [LORDS] ; Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1369

PETITIONS.

BARMAIDS' RESTRICTION OF EMPLOYMENT.—Petition from Kilmarnock, for legislation ; to lie upon the Table 1369

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petition from Pontyberem, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 1369

Apr. 22.] *Page*

ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 1370

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Crail, Anstruther, and District, against; to lie upon the Table 1370

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Banff; Banffshire; Crail; Kilwinning; and Leith, to lie upon the Table 1370

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Aberfeldy; Alexandria; Alyth; Auchinlech (two); Auchterarder; Birsay and Harray; Bonar Bridge; Bo'ness (two); Burnbank; Cadezow Castle; Cambusbarron; Cambusnethan; Coatbridge; Denny; Dumbarton; Falkirk; Fordyce; Galston; Gamrie and Macduff; Girvan; Glasgow (six); Greenock; Hamilton; Kilsyth; Kirkintilloch; Kirkwynd; Leith (two); Muirkirk (two); Musselburgh; Port Glasgow (two); Riccarton; St. Margaret's Hope; St. Quivox; Saltcoats; Sandbank; and Uphall; to lie upon the Table 1370

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1370

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.—Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1370

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Return [presented 19th April], to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 116] 1370

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Glamorgan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of shops within the Aber, Town, and Ystrad Mynach Wards of the Caerphilly Urban District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1371

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.—Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Aberdeen for 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 117] 1371

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.—Account presented, of the Gross Public Income and Expenditure in the year ended 31st March, 1907, together with the balances in the Exchequer at the commencement and at the termination of the year, and the amounts received into or issued from the Exchequer in respect of Funded and Unfunded Debt created or redeemed in the said year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 118] 1371

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Reports of the Local Education Authority and of His Majesty's Inspector upon the educational fitness of Mr. Milnes for the position of head teacher of the Royston National School, in the West Riding of Yorkshire [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1371

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 10th April; Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 119] 1371

Apr. 22.] Page

Papers Laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Wiltshire). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901; *Mr. Griffith Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 120.]

Inquiry into Charities (County of Berkshire). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 121.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Devon). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 26th July, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 122.] 1371

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Alleged Dissatisfaction amongst Irish National School Inspectors.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1372

Condition of Irish Land Purchase Guarantee Fund.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1374

Liverpool Post Office Medical Officer.—Question, Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1377

Non-Delivery of Letters, Early Closing Days.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1377

Appointment of Volunteer Adjutants.—Question, Mr. Fiennes (Oxfordshire, Banbury); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1377

Strength of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers—War Service.—Question, Mr. Fiennes; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1378

Meat Inspection in Scotland.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1378

Infants and Children in Public-Houses.—Question, Mr. Fiennes; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1379

Financial Deficiencies in Working of Irish Land Act.—Question, Mr. J. Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1379

Weight of Metal in Ships.—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 1382

House of Commons' Newspaper Reading Room.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1383

Bombay Municipal Elections.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley 1383

The Colonial Conference and Treatment of British Indians in the Colonies.—Question, Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon); Answer, Mr. Morley 1383

Deaths from Plague in India.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Morley 1383

Page

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1384

ENGLISH MEDICAL MEN ENGAGED ON INDIAN PLAGUE WORKS.—Question, Mr. Rutherford; Answer, Mr. Morley 1384

PLAGUE PRECAUTIONS.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1384

ARREARS OF TENANT PURCHASERS' ANNUITIES CHARGEABLE TO COUNTY KILDARE.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1385

THE BALLINGEARY DISTURBANCES—ACTION OF MR. O'HARA, RESIDENT MAGISTRATE.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1386

EXTRA POLICE IN COUNTY CLARE.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1386

IRISH POOR RATES—DISFRANCHISEMENT FOR NON-PAYMENTS.—Question, Mr. J. Redmond; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1388

DEDUCTION FROM GRANT TO COUNTY SLIGO IN RESPECT OF LAND PURCHASE.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1389

BUILDING OF NEW SCHOOLHOUSE AT GORTNACART.—Question, Mr. S. MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1390

ARRESTS AT ATHENRY—LEGAL AID FOR ACCUSED.—Question, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1390

KERRY COUNTY COUNCIL AND SIR C. CAMERON, PUBLIC ANALYST.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1391

SALE OF THE MORROGH BERNARD ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1392

CONVERSION OF 15-POUNDER FIELD GUNS; Question, Mr. A. Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1392

MILITIA OFFICERS AND THE NEW RESERVE OF OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. C. Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1392

DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL—ACCOMMODATION AT CHELSEA AND DOVER—DISPOSAL OF SITE.—Question, Mr. Horniman (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1393

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION AND THE WILTS AND GLOUCESTER VOLUNTEER INFANTRY BRIGADE CAMP.—Question, Mr. Partington (Derbyshire, High Peak); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1393

SOUTHAMPTON TRUNK LINE TELEPHONE FACILITIES.—Question, Colonel Phillips) (Southampton); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1394

PAUPER RELIEF AT LEICESTER, POPLAR, WEST HAM, AND WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. C. Nicholson (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 1395

AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS ON THE CONTINENT.—Question, Mr. Partington; Answer, Mr. Kearley 1397

Apr. 22.] *Page*

Cost of Visit to India of the Amir of Afghanistan.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Morley 1397

Condition and Hours of Labour in Bombay Textile Factories.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Morley 1399

Meetings of the Commissioners for Charitable Donations and Bequests in Ireland.—Question, Mr. McKillop (Armagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1399

Assaults on Postal Official in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Abel Smith (Hertfordshire, Hertford); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1399

Irish Boys and the Dublin Telegraph Messenger Service.—Question, Mr. Abel Smith; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1400

Disturbances at Athenry.—Question, Mr. Abel Smith; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1400

Irish Education Rates.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1400

Inspection of Farm of the Ormaithwaite Estate.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1401

Sittings of the New Grand Committees.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1401

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Officers in the Navy with Brevet Rank.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1401

Coastguard and Life Saving.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1402

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1402

Territorial Forces Bill.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1403

British Workmens' Report on German Labour Conditions.—Questions, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow), Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon), Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1403

War Office Pensions.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1404

Volunteer Corps' Liabilities.—Question, Sir J. Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1405

Officers Commissions.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1405

Cost of the Army.—Question, Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester), Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answers, Mr. Haldane 1406

Page

ARMY FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1407

RESERVE OF OFFICERS.—Question, Lord J. Joicey-Cecil (Lincolnshire, Stamford); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1408

ARMY FINANCIERS IN THE FIELD.—Question, Sir Robert Hobart (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1408

NAIROBI PRISON.—Question, Mr. Guy Baring; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N. W.) 1408

NATIVE POLICE IN EAST AFRICA.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1409

WEST INDIAN POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1409

WOOLWICH ARTISANS AND EMIGRATION.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.); 1409 Answers, Mr. Churchill .. ..

NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1410

EUROPEANS IN THE CHINESE CUSTOMS SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 1410

ASSAULT ON BRITISH SUBJECTS IN CHINA.—Questions, Mr. Rees, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1411

NEW HEBRIDES CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Barrie; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1411

THE CARNEGIE CELEBRATIONS AT PITTSBURG.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. Lea, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Runciman 1411

BRITISH REPRESENTATIVES AT THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1412

TEDDINGTON RATE COLLECTOR.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, N.) 1413

TAXIMETER CAB FARES.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1413

ALEXANDRA PARK RACES.—Questions, Mr. Lea, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1414

COST OF SCOTTISH POST OFFICE SERVICES.—Question, Mr. Barrie; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1415

TELEGRAPHISTS' DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1415

FREE EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1416

Page

Apr. 22.]

SCHOOL AGE REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 1416

IRISH PROVIDENT ASSURANCE COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1416

PUBLIC COMPANIES AND POLITICAL FUNDS.—Questions, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Kearley 1417

COAL STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Kearley 1418

CUSTOMS DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Kearley 1418

BRITISH MUSEUM READING ROOM.—Questions, Mr. Lea, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 1418

WOMEN TYPISTS.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1419

NORWEGIAN TRAWLERS AND SCOTTISH FISHERMEN.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1419

BEAULY AND NESS FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1420

PAISLEY LICENSING CASE.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1420

SCOTTISH DEER FORESTS.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1421

FOOTPATH RIGHTS IN ABERDEENSHIRE.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1421

GRASSMARKET, EDINBURGH.—Question, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1422

SCOTTISH EDUCATION ACTS.—Question, Mr. Gulland; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1422

FORT WILLIAM CHURCH DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Gulland; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1423

DANGEROUS LUNATICS.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 1423

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS—PROMOTION OF CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1424

IRISH LAND ACT FINANCE.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, N.), Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.), Captain Craig, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid), and Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs), Mr. Runciman.. 1425

IRISH POST OFFICE AND GUARANTEED LAND STOCK TRANSACTIONS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1432

Apr. 22.] *Page*

THE COMMITTEE OF DEFENCE.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1432

SCOTTISH SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1432

TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH.—Questions, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, Holderness); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1433

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1434

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1435

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. Clement Edwards (*Denbigh Districts*) 1435

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Leave given to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 123.]

Minutes of the proceedings of the Committee to be printed. [No. 123.] 1436

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).—Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had dischaged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping and Manufactures: Mr. Attorney-General. Sir Frederick Cawley, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Sir Francis Channing, Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Alexander Cross, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. David Davies, Mr. Vaughan-Davies. Mr. Timothy Davies, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Akers-Douglas, Mr. Duckworth, Mr. Charles Duncan, Mr. Ferens, Mr. Munro-Ferguson, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Haddock, Mr Harrison-Broadley, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Idris, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Kettle, Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. Bonar Law, Colonel Long, Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Lupton, Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh, Mr. M'Killop, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Murray, Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Parkes, Mr. Partington, Dr. Pollard, Major Renton, Mr. Thomas Richards, Sir George Robertson, Mr. John Robertson, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Rogers, Sir Robert Ropner, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Herbert Samuel, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Soames, Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Austin Taylor, Mr. Theodore Taylor. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Verney, Mr. Walrond, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. George 'White, Mr. Osmond Williams, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Young.

Report to lie upon the Table 1436

Apr. 22.] *Page*

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

INCOME TAX.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Income Tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. Austin Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 1437
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 1454
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1460
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 1468
Sir T. P. Whittaker (*Yorks., W.R., Spen Valley*) 1471
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (*Aston Manor*) 1478
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 1483
Mr. Hicks Beach (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 1490

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed, without Question put.

London Port and Docks Bill [BY ORDER].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Barnard (*Kidderminster*) 1493
Mr. W. Benn (*Tower Hamlets, St. George's*) 1498

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now ' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day six months.' "—(*Mr. Barnard.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

Sir E. Boyle (*Taunton*) 1502
Mr. Ellis (*Notts., Rushcliffe*) 1508
Mr. Wile (*Islington, S.*) 1510
Mr. W. F. D. Smith (*Strand, Westminster*) 1513
Sir A. Spicer (*Hackney, Central*) 1515
Mr. W. Pearce (*Tower Hamlets, Limehouse*) 1516
Mr. Bowles (*Lambeth, Norwood*) 1518
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorks., W.R., Elland*) 1520
The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 1524
Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 1531

Apr. 23.] *Page*

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That Income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)—resumed.

Question again proposed.

Committee report Progress; to sit again on Wednesday 1532

Advertisement Regulations Bill.—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee 1532

LOCAL TAXATION GRANTS (CONSOLIDATED FUND).—Committee to consider of authorising the payment of certain Grants to Local Taxation Accounts out of the Consolidated Fund, instead of out of the Revenues out of which they are payable under the present Law (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Runciman*) 1532

Adjourned at ten minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, that the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the petition for additional provisions in the Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.] and the Midland Railway Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and leave given to the Committees on the Bills to insert the additional provisions.

Read, and agreed to 1533

Baines' Name Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with an Amendment 1533

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [H.L.]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; King Edwards' Hospital Fund for London Bill [H.L.]—Reported, with Amendments.. 1533

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill; Bude Gas Bill; Falmouth Gas Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed 1533

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1533

Apr. 23.]

Page

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed 1533

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, that the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 25th of February and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed 1533

Royal Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, &c.,) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the councils of the administrative county of Surrey and the county boroughs of Birkenhead and Southport to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts—was presented by the Lord President (E. Crewe); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 35) 1533

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3765. Saxony (Leipzig).
No. 3766. Wurtemburg (trade and agriculture).
No. 3767. Turkey (Adrianople).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1534

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Treasury minute, dated 16th April, 1907, sanctioning the sale of a plot of land at Kingstown known as Battery Plot, together with a further plot adjoining the municipal baths, to the Kingstown Urban District Council: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1534

THAMES CONSERVANCY.—General Report of the Proceedings of the Conservators of the River Thames during the year ended 31st December, 1906, with Statement of the Accounts of the Conservators of the River Thames for that year: Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1534

Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 1534

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1535
The Earl of Halsbury 1537

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Rule Committee Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 1538

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Alverstone 1538

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Judicature Bill [H.L.]—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 1539

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 1539
Lord Alverstone 1541
The Lord Chancellor 1542

On Question, Bill read 3ª and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, Etc.) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (various powers) Bill.—Commons' Message of the 26th of March last considered (according to order), moved that a Committee of Five Lords be appointed to join with a Committee of the House of Commons to consider the said Bills as mentioned in the said Message; and that the said Committee be named by the Committee of Selection (The Earl Carrington); agreed to; and ordered accordingly 1542

House adjourned at five minutes' past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.—Read the third time. and passed 1543

South Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill.—As amended considered; to be read the third time 1543

Taff Vale Railway Bill.—As amended considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1543

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 1543

Brighouse Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1543

Apr. 23.] *Page*

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee:—

"That, in the case of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided the powers of guarantee and of raising money and applying their funds proposed to be conferred upon the county council of the county of Meath be struck out of the Bill unless proof be given to the Committee on the Bill that the county council of the county of Meath have approved the Bill with or without modification in the manner prescribed by Standing Order 67:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

"That, in the case of the Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

"That, in the case of the Great Central Railway Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to insert the additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

Resolutions agreed to 1543

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.—(*Mr. Deputy Chairman*) 1544

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.—Petition from Woolwich, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table 1544

FEUS AND BUILDING LEASES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dalziel, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1544

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Arbroath; Inverness; Kirkwall; and, Peeblesshire; to lie upon the Table .. 1544

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen (three); Ancrum; Ardrossan; Ayr; Ayrshire; Beauly; Birsay; Bridge of Allan; Broughty Ferry; Butterburn; Cadder; Castle Douglas; Cromarty; Cupar; Dalbeatie; Dalkeith (two); Darnick; Denny; Dumbarton (two); Dundee (two); Dunipace; Dunoon; Edinburgh; Fraserburgh; Gamrie and Macduff; Glasgow (seven); High Blantyre; Innerleithen; Invergordon; Inverkeithing; Inverness; Kilbarchan; Kilmacolm; Kilmarnock (two); Kilsyth; Kingussie (two); Kirkcudbright; Kirkwall; Kirriemuir; Larkhall; Lesmahagow (two); Lochbroom; Lochcarron; Lochee; Maybole; Nairn; Newmilns; Paisley; Pollokshaws; Port Glasgow; Portnahaven; Renton; Ricarton; Ringford; Sanday; Stevenston; Stornoway; Strichen; Stromness; Tarbert; Thurso; Tillicoultry; Turiff United Free Church of Scotland (two); Uyeasound; and, Westerdale; to lie upon the Table 1544

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petitions for legislation: From Isle of Thanet; and, West Bromwich; to lie upon the Table 1545

Page

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from West Bromwich, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 1545

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports (Annual Series), Nos. 3765 to 3767 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1545

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 16th April, 1907, sanctioning the sale of a plot of land at Kingstown, known as Battery Plot, together with a further plot adjoining the municipal baths, to the Kingstown Urban District Council [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 1545

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Thames Conservancy.—General Report and Accounts of the Conservators for 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 124] 1545

EAST INDIA (DEATHS FROM PLAGUE, ETC.).—Address for "Return showing the number of Deaths and the Death Rates per million living in India for each of the last thirty years from Plague, Cholera, Enteric or Typhoid Fever, and Small Pox respectively."—(*Sir William Collins*) 1545

BOARD OF TRADE (REPORTS).—Copies ordered "(1) of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Great Central Railway Bill; and (2) of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) 1545

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1546

STOPPAGES FOR LOST TIME IN DOCKYARDS.—Question, Sir John Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1546

BUILDING OF THE DREADNOUGHT—RETURN OF SHIP FITTERS' ASSISTANTS TO THEIR SHOPS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1546

POST OFFICE—LIMITED COMPETITION FOR MALE LEARNERS AT DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 1547

DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXATION IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1547

OFFICERS' EXTRA PAY FOR BREVET RANK ON SEA-GOING SHIPS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1548

SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS AT SIND.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley 1548

PAYMENT OF DEPUTY COUNTY COURT JUDGES IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1549

Apr. 23.] *Page*

APPOINTMENT TO THE COLONIAL AUDIT BRANCH.—Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1549

TREASURY GRANTS TO UPKEEP OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON ROOMS. —Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1550

THE COLONIAL AUDIT BRANCH.—Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1551

GUARANTEED IRISH LAND STOCK.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1551

NORTH CHINA CAMPAIGN—SPECIAL PROMOTION FOR NAVAL OFFICERS.—Question, Sir John Benn ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1552

PAY OF CHARGEMEN IN PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon ; Answer, Mr. Edmund 1553

WATERFORD AND LONDON MAILS.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1553

BOARD OF TRADE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT.— Question, Mr. Jenkins (Chatham) ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1554

INCOME TAX RETURNS.—Question, Sir F. Dixon-Hartland (Middlesex, Uxbridge) ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1555

LABOURERS' COTTAGES AT COOTEHILL.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1555

REINSTATEMENT OF IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF THOMAS BRADY.— Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1556

RETURN OF LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1556

CONDITION OF IRISH CATTLE.—Question, Mr. Field ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1557

WAR OFFICE CONTRACTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1557

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL CADETS.—Question, Mr. Walker (Leicestershire, Melton), Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) ; Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1558

BREVET RANK PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1559

COMMAND OF THE MALTESE GARRISON.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1559

EASTERN COMMAND AUXILIARY FORCES.—Question, Mr. A. L. Lever (Essex, Harwich) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1560

SURVEY OF INDIA.—Question, Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 1560

LAHORE DEMONSTRATIONS.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Morley 1561

NEW HEBRIDES—TRADE IN INTOXICATING LIQUORS.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1561

PORT OF SPAIN BOROUGH COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1562

PUBLIC WORKS AT TANGIER.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) .. 1563

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1564

QUALIFICATIONS AND APPOINTMENT OF QUARRY MANAGERS.—Question, Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1564

POOR PRISONERS' DEFENCE.—Questions, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1565

WEST JESMOND OFF-LICENCE CASE.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1565

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS OF WORKPEOPLE.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1566

CLARE LUNATIC ASYLUM SEWERAGE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Burghs) 1567

COST OF POST OFFICE SERVICES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1568

WAGE RECEIPTS.—Question, Mr. Wilkie (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Sbdney Buxton 1568

ROYSTON HEAD TEACHERSHIP.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1568

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RIFLE CORPS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Byles, (Salford, N.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1569

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 1570

NEW GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT WHITEHALL.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1570

Apr. 23.]

Page

Licensing Compensation Appeals.—Question, Colonel Herbert (Monmouthshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1570

City of London Charities.—Question, Sir D. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District); Answer, Mr. Tomkinson 1571

Kilshanny Evicted Tenant.—Question, Mr. Halpin; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1573

Athenry Outrages.—Questions, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 1573

Ballinageeragh Rioters.—Questions, Sir Berkeley Sheffield, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 1574

Munster Rents.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1574

Queen's County Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1575

Albemarle Estate Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. Thomas F. Symth (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1576

Dublin Civil Servants.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1576

Dublin Post Office Employees Grievances.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Sidney Buxton 1578

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1578

Colonies and the Tariffs.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Sir H. Cambell-Bannerman 1579

Defence of the Colonies.—Question, Mr. Arnold Cox; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1579

Assistant Clerks.—Question, Mr. Alden (Midlesex, Tottenham); Answer Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1579

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with an Amendment.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 125.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 125.]

Bill as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday, 1st July 1580

New Member Sworn.—George Smith Clark, esquire, for the Borough of Belfast (North Belfast Division) 1580

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES AND CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).— Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the three Standing Committees for the consideration of all Public Bills not relating exclusively to Scotland, which may be committed to a Standing Committee.

STANDING COMMITTEE A.

Mr. Adkins, Mr. Arthur Allen, Sir William Anson, Mr. Arkwright, Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Baker, Mr. Godfrey Baring, Mr. Beckett, Sir John Bethell, Mr. Boland, Mr. Cave, Sir Frederick Cawley, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Chance, Mr. Cobbold, Sir William Collins, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. David Davies, Mr. Ellis Davies, Mr. Timothy Davies, Mr. Devlin, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Sir William Foster, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. Secretary Gladstone, Mr. Glover, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Gwynne, Mr. Harrison-Broadley, Mr. Alexander Harvey, Mr. William Edwin Harvey, Captain Hervey, Mr. Hodge, Mr. William Hope, Sir John Jardine, Lord John Joicey-Cecil, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Lambton, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. McKillop, Mr. Mansfield, Sir Henry Norman, Mr. Nussey, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Parkes, Mr. Partington, Dr. Pollard, Mr. Thomas Richards, Mr. Rickett, Mr. Charles Roberts, Mr. Rothschild, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Herbert Samuel, Mr. Seaverns, Major Seely, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Smyth, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. Theodore Taylor, Mr. Walrond, Mr. John Ward, and Mr. Cathcart Wason.

STANDING COMMITTEE B.

Sir John Baker, Captain Balfour, Mr. Barnard, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Bright, Mr. Burns, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Byles, Viscount Castlereagh, Lord Robert Cecil, Sir Francis Channing, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Clynes, Major Coates, Mr. Cochrane, Dr. Cooper, Sir Edwin Cornwall, Sir Henry Cotton, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Vaughan Davies, Mr. Evans, Mr. Ferens, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Haddock, Mr. George Hardy, Mr. Harwood, Mr. James Haslam, Mr. Hazleton, Colonel Ivor Herbert, Mr. Higham, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Hutton, Mr. William Jones, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kettle, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Lane-Fox, Sir Joseph Leese, Sir Francis Lowe, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Massie, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Mond, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Murray, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Parker, Mr. Paulton, Sir Francis Powell, Mr. Charles Price, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Richardson, Mr. John Robertson, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Soares, Mr. Austin Taylor, Mr. David Alfred Thomas, Mr. Walton, Mr. Walsh, Sir Thomas Whittaker, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Wyndham, and Mr. Yoxall.

STANDING COMMITTEE C.

Mr. William Abraham (Cork), Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Alden, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Barran, Sir John Benn, Mr. Billson, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Brace, Mr. Bramsdon, Mr. Carlile, Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Herbert Craig, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Cross, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Dickinson, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Dolan, Sir George Doughty, Mr. Duckworth, Mr. Charles Duncan, Mr. James Duncan, Mr. Clement Edwards, Mr. Everett, Mr. Denison Faber, Mr. Findlay, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Hart-Davies, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Healy, Mr. Idris, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Lehmann, Mr. Lloyd-George, Colonel Charles Long, Mr. Walter Long, Sir Philip Magnus, Major McMicking, Mr. Jeremiah

MacVeagh, Viscount Morpeth, Mr. Napier, Mr. Paul, Earl Percy, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Wiliam Priestley, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Rees, Mr. Goerge Henry Roberts, Sir George Scott Robertson, Mr. Abel Smith, Mr. Soames, Sir Albert Spicer, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Verney, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Vivian, Mr. Walker, Mr. Warner, Mr. George White, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Osmond Williams, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, and Mr. Young.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had nominated Committee A as the Committee on which Government Bills shall not have precedence.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had selected the following eight Members to be the Chairmen's Panel, and to serve as Chairmen of the Four Standing Committees to be appointed under Standing Order No. 47:—Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Sir William Holland, Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Stuart Wortley, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Mr. John William Wilson.

Reports to lie upon the Table 1580

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Army (Annual) Bill, without Amendment 1582

NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1582

Motion made, and Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the early Notification of Births,—(*Lord R. Cecil*)—put and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Verney, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Sherwell, and Mr. Tennant.

Notification of Births Bill.—"To provide for the early Notification of Births," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 169.]

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the Forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs.) 1584
Mr. J. Ramsey Macdonald (Leicester) 1593
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1601
Mr. Bennett (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) 1611
Mr. Brace (Glamorganshire, S.) 1615
Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) 1617
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1620
Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.) 1633
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1637
Captain Kincaid Smith (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon) 1642
Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) 1647

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chariman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceedings was postponed without Question put.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln) .. ..
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1649

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the Forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.'—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof," resumed.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Apr. 23.]

Page
Mr. Hunt 1650
Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston) 1658
Mr. D. Davies (Montgomeryshire) 1665
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 1667
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 1670

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 388 ; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 139.)

Main Question proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the business.

Whereupon Mr. SECRETARY HALDANE rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided ; Ayes, 343 ; Noes, 31. (Division List, No. 140)

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)

Adjourned at Twenty-nine mintes after Eleven o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CLXXII.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SEVENTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 8*th April*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Westmeath (South Westmeath Division), in the room of Donal Sullivan, esquire, deceased.—(*Mr. Patrick O'Brien.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Basingstoke Gas Bill, Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Maidstone Gas Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramway Bill [Lords]; Medway Lower Navigation Bill [Lords]; Newquay and District Water Bill [Lords]; Royal Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

London United Tramways Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

WATFORD AND EDGWARE RAILWAY BILL.

Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Audlton and Dalserf; Burslem; Carronshore; Cowie; Craighead; Cwmneol; Denny; Dennyloanhead; East Glean; Fforchaman; Hanford; Kilsyth; Kinflats;

Larbert; Polmaise; Quarter; and, Redding Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Arbroath, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Bannockburn; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Grangemouth (two); Lossiemouth; and Montrose; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Reading, against; to lie upon the Table.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from Ravenstonedale, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Easter Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

1. Trade Reports (Annual Series). Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3753 and 3754.

2. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series). Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 657 and 658.

3. Egypt (No. 1, 1907). Copy of Reports by His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General on the Finances, Administration, and Condition of Egypt and the Soudan in 1906.

4. Most - Favoured - Nation Clauses (Commercial, No. 3, 1907). Copy of Return of Most-Favoured-Nation Clauses in existing Treaties of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies, in force on the 1st January, 1907.

5. National Treatment Clauses (Commercial, No. 4, 1907). Copy of Return of National Treatment Clauses in existing Treaties of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies, in force on the 1st January, 1907.

6. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission). Copy of Reports on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster, preserved at Grimsthorpe.

7. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission). Copy of Calendar of the Stuart Papers belonging to His Majesty the King, preserved at Windsor Castle. Vol. III.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War, with Tables showing the War Establishments and Composition of the proposed Field Force and other particulars, under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Memorandum showing how various enactments are affected by the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.

Accounts presented, for the year 1906, with an Account of extraordinary Works executed other than the general Repairs for the same period [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Return of the Areas, Population, and Valuation of Counties, Burghs and Parishes in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLICE (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Forty-ninth Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector of

Constabulary for Scotland for the year ended 31st December, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of Report by the Local Government Board for Scotland as to the Proceedings of Distress Committees in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland allocating certain sums out of the General Fund of the Board of Manufactures [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland with regard to the establishment, powers, etc., of the new Board of Trustees and the purposes for which certain buildings shall be held [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCES AND ANNUITIES.

Account presented, of all Moneys received and of the disposal thereof, and of all Contracts for the grant of Deferred Life Annuities and for Payments on Death made during the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 99.]

CROWN'S NOMINEE ACCOUNT.

Abstract Account presented, of Receipts and Payments of the Treasury Solicitor, in the year ended 31st December, 1906, in the Administration of Estates on behalf of the Crown, and Alphabetical List of Intestates' Estates in respect of which Letters of Administration were granted to the Treasury Solicitor as Crown's Nominee, and of other cases (partial Intestacies, etc.) in which accounts were opened in the Books of the Treasury Solicitor in the same year in respect of moneys received by him as Crown's Nominee [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 100.]

GREEK LOAN OF 1898.

Account presented, up to 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EGYPTIAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1885.

Account presented, up to 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half year ending on the 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 101.]

REMUNERATION OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS TO CROWN COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th December, 1906; *Mr. Walker*]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Irish Land Purchase Fund. Accounts of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Irish Land Purchase Fund in the year ended 31st March, 1906, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 102.]

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Return ordered, "of all instances in which the Inspectors of the Board of Trade, in their Reports on Railway Accidents inquired into by them since and including the year 1900, have represented that the hours of any of the Railway Servants on duty on the occasion of such accidents have been unduly long, stating the name, date, and nature of such accidents, and the Railway or Railways on which they occurred, and giving, in full, the passages in such Reports relating to such unduly long hours."—(*Sir Francis Channing.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

City Corporation Lunches.

Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether the Commissioners' attention has been called to the fact that the members of the Committees of the City Corporation are allowed at each sitting a half-crown lunch, a fixed sum also being allowed for drink; that the cost of these luncheons amounted to £3,000 or £4,000 a year; that this money is voted out of a fund known as the City Cash, the proceeds of bequests made long ago; whether the Commissioners have power to inquire as to the purpose to which the income of old bequests is at present applied; whether, if the intentions of the donors cannot be carried out, the Commissioners can require a scheme to be drawn up devoting the income to the public good; whether the Commissioners have approved of any scheme allowing the income of these City bequests to be spent in refreshments; and, if not, will the Commissioners at once make inquiry and consider the advisability of devoting the income derived from these bequests to some useful public purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Trevelyan.*) The Commissioners understand that the term "the City's cash" is applied to property belonging to the Corporation of the City of London which, except to a comparatively small extent, is not subject to charitable trusts. The particulars of the charities comprised in the City's cash are mentioned in the Reports to the Commissioners on the Charities in the Administrative County of London, vol. 7. Except as to these charities, it does not appear that the Commissioners have power to inquire into the origin and application of the City's cash.

London Unemployed Grant.

SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state, in connection with the money allocated to London out of the grant of £200,000 voted by Parliament for contributions in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen's Act, 1905, the number of men helped, the numbers in each branch of trade, the rate of wages paid, and the duration of employment.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the number of men assisted out of the money received by the Central (Unemployed) Body for London from the grant, between 10th November, 1906, and 31st March, 1907, was 2,821. The exact figures as to the trades in which the men are usually employed cannot at present be given. The wages paid have varied from 20s. to 21s. per week, and the average duration of the employment on the various works has varied from four weeks to eight and a half weeks.

Condemned Tinned Goods.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, at a recent auction in the City of London (21st March, 1907), a large quantity of tinned goods were offered for sale, some of which were seized and destroyed as unfit for food by the port sanitary authority in whose district they were lying, although the owner of the goods stated that some of these goods were returned military stores from South Africa; and whether he is aware that a quantity of these goods are still in this country and on the way, and that arrangements are apparently being made to put them on the market from time to time at the rate of one-halfpenny per pound after expense of freight, storage, etc., has been paid; and whether, under these circumstances, he will take such steps as may be necessary in the interests of public health to prevent such sales.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The facts appear to be generally as stated. Further legislation of the kind contemplated by the Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill now before Parliament is necessary for the proper dealing with a matter of this kind, but in the particular instance mentioned attention was given by the local authorities concerned to the condition of the goods sold at the auction. A special notice was exhibited at the auction to the effect that they were sold subject to being passed by the medical officer of health of the district in which they were lying; and steps were taken by the medical officers of health of the City and Port of London, of Stepney, and of Finsbury to obtain the surrender of such articles of food as were considered to be unfit for human consumption.

Irish Financial Relations.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the total amount of taxation raised in Ireland in the financial years 1841, 1851, 1861, 1871, 1881, 1891, 1901, and 1906 respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) For the purposes of the Financial Relations Returns, Ireland's true contribution to Revenue was worked out for the last financial year of each decade since the amalgamation of the British and Irish Exchequers. It is not clear which financial years the hon. Member refers to in his Question, but presumably those shown in the subjoined statement are sufficiently near.

Financial Year.	Tax Revenue contributed by Ireland.
	£
1839–40	5,077,000
1849–50	4,564,000
1859–60	7,341,000
1869–70	6,868,000
1879–80	6,437,000
1889–90	6,691,000
1899–1900	7,619,000
1905–6	8,254,000

Cost of Government.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state, from the last available statistics, the total annual cost, and the rate per head of the population of England and Wales, under each of the following heads: Office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Local Government Board for England and Wales, Judiciary, Police, and Education, together with the cost of Civil Government in England and Wales, with the rate per head of the population.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The subjoined statement shows the cost of the respective services, so far as they are charged on the Votes of Parliament or the Consolidated Fund, for the financial year 1905–6. The figures are taken from the statement of net cost appended to the volume of Appropriation Accounts, with adjustments, where necessary, to exclude Scottish or Irish services charged on the English Votes:—

	Net cost.	Per head of population (middle of 1905.)
	£	*s.* *d.*
Home Office	175,672	0 1¼
Local Government Board	215,946	0 1½
Supreme Court of Judicature and County Courts	349,543	0 2½
Board of Education	12,726,000	7 5½
Universities and Colleges	169,647	0 1¼

The total of the charges of Civil Government for England and Wales in the year 1905–6, as shown on page 12 of House of Commons Paper, No. 278, of 1906, was £17,898,000, or 10s. 5¾d. per head of population. For information as to the cost of education beyond the charge upon the Parliamentary Votes, I beg leave to refer the hon. Member to the Board of Education, and to the Home Office as regards the cost of police, which is not a direct charge on Imperial funds.

Irish Contribution to Imperial Expenditure.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the cost of Irish services defrayed out of Imperial funds has increased from £5,939,000 in 1895–6 to £7,635,000 in 1905–6; and whether he can state under what heads the increase has been made up, and how much under each head.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The grants to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account have risen from £394,000 to £1,445,000, or by £1,051,000. The cost of Post Office services in Ireland has risen from £808,000 to £1,199,000, or by £391,000. The remainder of the increase (£254,000) is the balance of the movements upward and downward on the remaining Votes for Irish services. It is more than accounted for by the addition of the Ireland Development Grant (£185,000) and the increase (£91,000) in the cost of the Irish Land Commission.

Silver Currency for the West Indies.

Mr. O. C. PHILIPPS (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how much profit has been made out of the silver currency shipped to the West Indian Colonies and British Guiana during the last twenty years.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The estimated profit, representing the difference between the bullion value and the coined value of the silver supplied, may be taken as £400,000; but it must be remembered that the Imperial Government accepts the liability for the redemption of worn coins at their full nominal value.

Dublin Assistant Clerks.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any representations have recently been made to him for promotion of assistant clerks serving in Dublin offices; whether assurances have been given by his predecessors that any cases in which assistant clerks are represented by the heads of their departments to be engaged on the work of Second Division clerks the question of raising their salaries would be considered; whether, in at least one recent case, a clerk with nearly twelve years total service and a salary of less than £100 a year, has had a recommendation for promotion indefinitely postponed; and whether he will apply to this case the precedent given in the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in which a minimum salary of £120 was given to clerks of long service, small salaries, and meritorious conduct.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have traced one case which appears to answer to the description given in the Question. The facts in that case are that the head of the Department recommended an assistant clerk for promotion to the Second Division, and the Treasury in reply stated that they did not feel able to take the application into consideration before the occurrence of a vacancy to which he could be appointed, either in his own or in some other Department. I am not aware of any ground for increasing the salary of the clerk in question.

Electric Power for the Navy.

Mr. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty in respect of what naval establishment the provisions for electric light and power under the Act of 1905 has been reduced by £200,000.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The reduction has been distributed *pro rata* over the whole of the naval establishments, and is not confined to any one.

Cost of Torpedo Ranges.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty why the total Estimate in the Act of 1905 for £320,000 in connection with torpedo ranges has been reduced by more than 100 per cent.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) After much investigation the Admiralty expect to be able to meet their requirements with the reduced total Estimate mentioned.

Indian Section, Imperial Institute.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has arrived at a decision in respect of the future position and constitution of the Indian section of the Imperial Institute; and, if so, whether any information on this subject can be furnished to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The matter is still under my consideration. For the present, and until a decision has been arrived at, the section will continue to be managed by the Indian Committee.

Lieutenant-Colonels' Pay.

Mr. HADDOCK: To ask the Secretary of State for War what sum has been taken in the Estimates for 1907–8 to meet the increased pay of lieutenant-colonels.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A sum of money has been taken in the Estimates to meet this service. I am in communication with the Treasury as to the rate of increase per arm, and I am not yet able to state the exact figures.

Territorial Force—Cost of Uniform.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the estimated cost for providing 300,000 men of the territorial force with one new suit of clothes (service dress) for each man enrolled, together with boots, head-dress, overcoat, etc.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The cost of a new suit of service dress for infantry, including great coat, boots, helmet, cap, and badge and putties would amount to a sum of £2 17s. 3d. per man, or about £858,750 for 300,000 men.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Indian Trade Journal.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the *Indian Trade Journal* issued by the Commercial Department of the Government of India, not only disseminates useful information, but expresses opinions and pronounces upon controversial commercial questions and appreciations of particular manufacturing processes and plant; whether the Government of India is responsible for such opinions, pronouncements, and appreciations; and whether he will consider the desirability of not allowing a Government publication, unlike the *Board of Trade Journal*, to compete in this behalf with private newspapers, journals, and other publications.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs): I understand that the editor of the *Indian Trade Journal* is not restricted to compiling extracts, but may comment on commercial subjects. The public have been informed so lately as February, 1907, that opinions and suggestions thus inserted in the *Journal* are those of the editor, not of the Government. The Government of India have allowed this latitude in order that the *Journal* may keep in touch with Indian trade. I have no information that it competes improperly with private journals, and I do not propose to interfere in the matter.

Bimlipatam.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the project for connecting Bimlipatam with the East Coast Railway by a branch line, which was formerly approved by the Government of India, and was indeed part of the original East Coast Railway project, is still alive or has lapsed, to the detriment of one of the few practicable ports on the coast of Coromandel and to the loss of the trade of Bimlipatam, which has been created by the enterprise of generations of European and Indian merchants.

Mr. MORLEY: The project for constructing the line in question by private agency has lapsed, and I am not aware that the Government of India have any intention of constructing it as a State line.

*Mr. REES: Could a private company make a tramway there, or has the concession completely lapsed?

Mr. MORLEY: I understand it has completely lapsed, but I will inquire as to that.

Slavery in Zanzibar.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can see his way to signalise the passing of the Slave Trade Prohibition Act 100 years ago by putting an end to the legal *status* of slavery in Zanzibar coast strip.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): On 7th January the Secretary of State for the Colonies addressed a despatch to the officer administering the Government of the East Africa Protectorate intimating that, in his opinion, the time had come to abolish the legal *status* of slavery in the mainland as well as in the island dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, and requesting him to furnish a report upon the question of the most convenient measures to be taken to carry that policy into effect. It was also impressed upon the officer in question that Lord Elgin was anxious that the matter should be proceeded with as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. BYLES: Is not this the only spot under the British flag where the institution of slavery enjoys the protection of the British flag?

Mr. CHURCHILL was understood to say that, so far as he knew, it was the only place under the control of the Colonial Office.

British Coloured Subjects in the Congo.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the communication to the Foreign Office from the Congo Reform Association, dated 5th February, in regard to the ill-treatment of British coloured subjects and violation of the clauses of the Brussels Act in regard to the importation of firearms in the Upper Welle district (north-eastern region of the Congo State); and, if so, what steps His Majesty's Government are taking in regard to the matter.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury; for Sir Edward Grey): The allegations in regard to the ill-treatment of British coloured subjects in the Congo State were contained in a *précis* of a petition stated to have been delivered to the Sub-Commissioner of the Nile Province in the presence of the gentleman who brought the matter to the notice of the Congo Reform Association. My right hon. friend referred the matter to the Colonial Office, and a report has been called for from the local authorities. With regard to the reported importation of firearms into the north-eastern portion of the Congo State it is considered that a favourable opportunity of discussing the whole question of the importation of arms and ammunition into Africa will be afforded at the Arms Conference which is to meet next spring at Brussels.

The Channel Tunnel.

Mr. BYLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the surprise and disappointment generally expressed in France at the Government's opposition to the Channel Tunnel scheme; has he received any communications from the French Government in the same sense; and can he assure the House that the cordiality of the *entente* with France is not impaired.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend has received no communication from the French Government on the subject, but he understands that the reasons for our reluctance to sanction the scheme are well understood and entirely appreciated in France. And he would draw the attention of the hon. Member to the statement of the Prime Minister that:—"His Majesty's Government fully recognise the deep concern felt in this matter, and have no other desire than to take the House fully into their confidence, even in anticipation of the early stages of the Bill. Briefly I may say that our view of the public interest leads us to be opposed to this project of a tunnel. Even supposing the military dangers involved were to be amply guarded against, there would exist throughout the country a feeling of insecurity which might lead to a constant demand for increased expenditure, naval and military, and a continual risk of unrest and possibly alarm, which, however unfounded, would be most injurious in its effect, whether political or commercial. On the other hand, there has not been disclosed any such prospect of advantage to the trade and industries of the country as would compensate for those evils. As to the personal convenience of passengers and the transit of light articles, it seems well that further consideration should be given to other means of conveyance, such as are used in the ferries across great channels of the sea in other parts of the world. These considerations lead us, while rejoicing in anything that facilitates free communication with our neighbours, to view this project with disfavour." It is quite out of the question that such a statement could have any unfavourable consequences.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.

Mr. GODDARD CLARKE (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Mr. Edmund J. Green, of 101, Peckham Park Road, S.E., was refused by the magistrate at Lambeth police court a certificate of exemption from vaccination, although he stated that he conscientiously believed that vaccination would be detrimental to the health of his child; and will he take steps to bring before the magistrates the views of the Lord Chief Justice as to their duties under the conscience clause of The Vaccination Act, 1898, pending such alteration of the law as the Government have in contemplation.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): I have no information of the facts of this particular case; but the law requires an applicant to satisfy the magistrate that he conscientiously believes that vaccination will be injurious to the child in question, and therefore I cannot take any action in the matter. The magistrates are well aware of the views of the Lord Chief Justice on the subject.

Church Army Workshops.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the workshops occupied by the Church Army, in which articles are adapted for sale precisely in the same way as in other workplaces, are registered by the factory inspectors; whether these places have been regularly visited by Government inspectors; and whether the provisions of the Factory Act are complied with.

MR. GLADSTONE: These places have not, I understand, been registered as factories or workshops. The application of the Factory Act depends, not merely on whether articles are adapted for sale, but also on whether the work is carried on by way of trade or for purposes of gain; and it would not seem that institutions of the kind referred to can be said to be carried on by way of trade or for purposes of gain. The inspectors have, however, from time to time paid visits to such institutions where industrial work is regularly carried on, and among them to the Church Army Homes, and given advice, and I am informed that the provisions of the Factory Act are generally well observed.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that these institutions are not carried on by way of profit?

MR. GLADSTONE: So far as I know. If the hon. Member can show me to the contrary, I shall, of course, be glad to receive information.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the goods produced in these factories really compete in the open market?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, I am aware of that; but it does not follow that the workshops of the Church Army are carried on for purposes of gain.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to legislate on the subject.

MR. GLADSTONE said he would consider the point.

Royal Patriotic Fund Offices.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, is the Government responsible for the rent of the Royal Patriotic Fund premises, Seymour House, Pall Mall; and on what Vote on the Estimates is it placed.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Under an arrangement made in 1904, which was to hold for fourteen years, an allowance of £600 a year is paid to the Royal Patriotic Fund Commission from the Vote for Public Buildings, Great Britain, to cover rent, rates and taxes, fuel, light, water, and any incidental expenses. Previously to this arrangement the Commission had received accommodation at the public expense rent and rate free.

MR. BYLES: Is it possible to criticise the action of the Patriotic Fund Commissioners on that Vote?

MR. RUNCIMAN: That is a matter for the Chairman to decide.

SUPPLY [5TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

CLASS I.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £43,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908, for Expenditure in respect of Royal Palaces."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) called attention to the item for restoring the panelling at the Orangery at Kensington Palace, and also asked if anything was being done in regard to the Grinling Gibbons' carving there. Some nine years ago when the restoration of the building took place, many coats of paint were removed from the panelling. History related that the original intention of Sir Christopher Wren had been to carry out the pannelling in oak, but that design was, owing to the niggardliness of the Lord High Treasurer of the day, refused, as was later an application for paint to cover the deal. To show the building as originally left a coat of clear varnish was put over the panelling, but it was not intended that it should remain so. He wished to know to what extent restoration was necessary, and whether painting it had been decided upon.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) asked what was proposed to be done to Holyrood Palace, and whether the restoration of the chapel at that palace was included in the Vote; also whether King's Park, Stirling, came under the same heading.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) said that as there was an item for the upkeep of the residential apartments at St. James's Palace, he wished to draw attention to a matter which was nothing short of a public scandal. The gentleman of the Cellars to the King, Mr. Kingscote, who occupied apartments in the Palace, and received a large salary from His Majesty's Privy Purse, was also in the employment of a foreign firm of champagne shippers, and received from them a salary of several thousands a year in order, he supposed, to push their brand of champagne at the Court.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think the point raised by the hon. Member had anything to do with the Vote before the Committee.

MR. LEA: The gentleman is in the occupation of apartments in St. James's Palace.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the Committee has anything to do with that.

MR. LEA: May I point out that these apartments, which are at present occupied by this gentleman, might be used for some other purpose?

Mr. Akers-Douglas.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee does not allocate these apartments nor does the Minister whose Estimates we are discussing. The matter is out of order.

MR. LEA: But the Committee pays for them.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) asked if anything could be done to restore the original stone work of Buckingham Palace, which was at present covered with coats of paint. If the paint could be removed and the original stone uncovered it would be a great improvement. The stone had been quarried near Edinburgh, and nothing was more offensive to a Scotsman than to see it covered with five or six coats of paint.

MR. MORTON asked the First Commissioner of Works whether he could tell the Committee under what conditions the champagne vendor already mentioned occupied his position at St. James' Palace.

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale) said before he replied in detail he wished to make an appeal on similar lines to that which he made last year; viz., that the Committee would allow all the Votes to pass that night with the exception of that for his own salary. The reason why he made the request was that the Office of Works was in a peculiar position with regard to these Votes. If the Votes were held over until August he would have lost a great deal of the best weather for building purposes, which would be an unsatisfactory state of affairs. With regard to the Orangery of Kensington Palace, which had been mentioned by the right hon. Member for St. Augustine's, a strong alkali pickle was unfortunately used in the previous renovation; that had injuriously affected the woodwork and caused an appearance of mildew, which it had been found impossible to remove. In consequence of the poor condition of the panelling they had decided to re-do it in the way it was no doubt done by Sir Christopher Wren, and paint it white.

He could also assure the right hon. Gentleman that the Grinling Gibbons carving would be touched very tenderly, if at all. In answer to the hon. Member for Sutherland, King's Park at Stirling did not come under the Vote. With regard to Holyrood Chapel, they had always taken the necessary steps for the preservation of the ruins; but as for restoration and rebuilding, that was a matter with which he was not officially concerned. It was left that the work should be carried out by a specified architect and trustees, and failing action on the part of those gentlemen the moneys to be devoted to that purpose should lapse. They had lapsed. After the ruling of the Chairman, the hon. Member for St. Pancras would not expect him to say anything about the subject he had raised, and as a matter of fact, he did not think it was a matter about which he could say anything.

MR. LEA asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that Mr. Kingscote acted as wine and spirit buyer to the Great Northern Railway, and that until eighteen months ago his letters were dated from St. James' Palace and bore the Royal Arms.

*MR. HARCOURT said he had no knowledge of the matter. With regard to the painting of the Scottish stone of Buckingham Palace, the stone used was so bad that it would not stand the English climate and the face crumbled away. For that reason the stone had to be treated with the preparation to which the hon. Member for Central Edinburgh had referred.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said the appeal the right hon. Gentleman had made was not an unusual one, and during the time he himself held the office of First Commissioner of Works he often had occasion to make a similar appeal. He was certain the Committee would recognise the reasonableness of the proposal. If they were to hold back their sanction to these Votes until August the building works would be seriously affected. It was important that the Votes should be passed, and he for one would raise no objection. He took it, however, that if the right hon. Gentleman's Votes were assented to by the Committee the Government did not intend to take any other business that night. He congratulated the First Commissioner of Works upon his answer with regard to the Orangery.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) asked whether any steps had been taken to preserve the Bore stone on the Field at Bannockburn.

*MR. HARCOURT said he recognised the interest taken in the stone by Scotsmen generally, and he had written to the proprietor on whose ground it stood suggesting that it should be placed under the care of the Office of Works. The reply he received was that the proprietor was unwilling to assent to such an arrangement and that the stone was properly cared for as it was; consequently he had no further powers in the matter.

*MR. MORTON asked what the right hon. Gentleman intended to do with regard to Holyrood Palace. A great deal required to be done to the palace to put it into a decent respectable state and one worthy of the United Kingdom. It was one of those palaces which were taken over at the time of the Union, with the undertaking that it should always be kept in repair out of funds to be provided by the United Kingdom. He wanted to know what steps the Government intended to take to put the palace in as good a condition as the Royal palaces in England, so that it might no longer be the disgrace it was at the present time.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) called attention to an item of £300 for the building of sheds for lawn mowers at Windsor. It seemed to him a very large amount to spend for such a purpose. He himself had built a shed 60 feet long and 30 feet wide with a corrugated iron roof, for about £40. There was also another item he had noticed, viz., the sum of £500 for a new fire alarm system at St. James' Palace. As far as he could gather it was not a system of fire prevention, including fire hydrants, etc., but merely an alarm system, by which communication could be obtained with the fire station. If the right hon. Gentleman could give them some explanation on the matter he would feel obliged.

*Mr. HARCOURT said that as far as Holyrood Palace was concerned, he spent some time there last August and he did not form such a bad opinion as the hon. Member for Sutherland entertained of its state of repair. It was quite clear that as far as the historical apartments were concerned, the less they did the better, so long as they just did enough to keep them going. What he desired to do was not to hand the palace over to restorers, but simply to preserve what there was; a few changes had been made, such as putting a new lamp in the quadrangle and repairing the sun-dial. With regard to the proposed shed for lawn mowers at Windsor the sum did appear rather a large one, but the mowers were large machines, considerable in number, with a large acreage to deal with. The Committee might rest assured that he would not spend more upon decorative building of that sort than was absolutely necessary to make it effective for its purpose, and at the same time to prevent its being an eyesore to, and an outrage upon the beautiful gardens around it. In the matter of the fire alarm system at St. James's Palace, the hon. Baronet seemed to be under the impression that they were simply putting up a bell which would communicate with the fire station.

Sir F. BANBURY: It certainly gives one that impression.

*Mr. HARCOURT said that was not so. It was really a complete system of fire alarms throughout all the passages and rooms of the Palace. It was a system which would replace one which was quite antiquated.

Sir F. BANBURY agreed that everything necessary should be done to provide for the safety of the palace, and he was quite content with the right hon. Gentleman's explanation. With regard to the shed for lawn mowers at Windsor, he was sure that no one would wish to destroy the amenities of one of the most beautiful palaces in Europe. He did not contemplate the putting up of an iron shed, but he would point out that close to the ground where the mowers would be used there were extensive shrubberies, and he thought that possibly a shed could be erected there which need not be of quite such an artistic and expensive character as that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. He was, however quite willing to accept the right hon. Gentleman's statement that the interests of economy had not been forgotten, his object in bringing the matter forward having been to obtain an explanation of the item. On the subject of Holyrood Palace, he intended to give his support to the right hon. Gentleman. The hon. Member for Sutherland, apparently, wanted Holyrood Palace put into a perfect state of repair.

Mr. MORTON said he asked for a decent, not perfect, state of repair.

Sir F. BANBURY pointed out that the building was an extremely old one.

*Mr. MORTON: Have you ever been there?

Sir F. BANBURY admitted that he had not, but he was prepared to take the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, in preference to that of the hon. Member for Sutherland. To put the palace in "decent" repair might mean the expenditure of £50,000 or £100,000, for when they started to repair old buildings they never knew when they were going to stop. He was astonished that the hon. Member should have made such a proposal, and he appealed to him not to lose that spirit of economy which so distinguished him when he sat for an English constituency.

Mr. MORTON said that the hon. Baronet's memory must be a very bad one. If he would read the *Hansard* reports of the date he had mentioned he would find that the question of repairing the Scottish palaces and castles was then discussed at much greater length than it was their intention to discuss it that night. He had a greater faith in the present First Commissioner of Works than he had in his predecessors, and before the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London attempted to criticise his (Mr. Morton's) action in the matter he should visit the spot and then perhaps he would be in a position to criticise his (Mr. Morton's) remarks. Nothwithstanding the fact that the hon. Baronet was going to support the Government in the matter, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would realise that they in Scotland expected, now they had a good First Commissioner of Works, that he would look after these matters and treat Scotland at least as well as England.

MR. LEA moved a reduction of the vote by £3,240 as a protest against a gentleman in the employ of a French champagne firm occupying apartments at St. James Palace at the public expense.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item E be reduced by £3,240."—(*Mr. Lea.*)

*MR. HARCOURT said he wished to make a serious protest against the hon. Member's Motion. He hoped Parliament was not going to step beyond its own limitations in the matter. In consideration of certain properties which were handed over to the State certain residences were transferred to His Majesty to be treated absolutely under his own control. There was no possible justification for dealing with the exercise of His Majesty's right of gift in these matters, and he hoped the Committee would not attempt to go into matters with which they really had no concern. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his Motion, which was to delete the sum required for the repair of the Palace as a whole.

MR. LEA said he was very loth to refuse the request of the right hon. Gentleman, but he felt convinced that, whatever limitations Parliament imposed upon itself when the Civil List was arranged, it was never in contemplation——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I allowed the explanation so that the matter might be made clear, but I cannot allow it to be discussed.

SIR F. BANBURY asked if it would be in order to protest against the reduction.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Baronet could protest against the reduction on its merits, but he could not go into the arguments which appeared to be in the mind of the hon. Member who moved the reduction.

SIR F. BANBURY said that the Chairman's ruling limited him considerably, but he quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it was most inopportune that such a reduction should be moved. It was really a private arrangement of His Majesty's. He would have great pleasure in supporting the Government, and he hoped the Committee would not attempt to interfere in the matter.

MR. LEA said he would withdraw his Motion, but he hoped that representations would be made in the proper quarter——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is constantly trying to get round my ruling.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £9,100, to complete the sum for Osborne.

MR. MORTON said that last session they were told that Osborne House, the munificent gift of His Majesty, was only open to officers in the Army. He asked why Tommy Atkins was shut out of that institution, which was a gift to the nation. It should be open to the private soldier as well as to the officer, and he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not in future see that all soldiers, whether officers or men of the non-commissioned ranks, should have the benefit of the gift.

SIR F. BANBURY said he understood that Osborne House was provided for cadets going into the Navy, and also as a training school for officers; there was also, of course, a convalescent home there. It was not a very large place.

MR. MORTON: Have you been there?

SIR F. BANBURY admitted that he had not been inside, but he had viewed the building from a distance. The Army and Navy had been reduced almost to vanishing point under the present Government, but if private soldiers and seamen as well as officers were allowed to go into Osborne House, the result would be the creation of an impossible state of affairs, as the building was only a small one. He had nothing to say upon the Vote except that he thought the item £758 for the gardens rather a large sum.

Sir W. EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) thought the point raised by the hon. Member for Sutherland was somewhat captious. Although he quite sympathised with his desire that private soldiers as well as officers should be given consideration, yet the hon. Member must be well aware that there was a magnificent institution at Netley for the non-commissioned men of the Army, and there were others of a similar kind scattered about the country, both for soldiers and for sailors. He believed that until the munificent gift of Osborne House there was no institution of the kind available for officers. The salaries enjoyed by many officers were very small, and he had known of cases where officers had been practically in a position of destitution, owing to the heavy expense attendant on long illness contracted while in the service of their country.

Mr. LEA supported the appeal which had been made to throw open Osborne House to the barrack room and lower deck. He pointed out that though there might be isolated cases of destitute officers, for every one of those there were forty similar cases from the non-commissioned ranks and the lower deck. There was not sufficient accommodation at Netley. At Osborne there were large open spaces where the men returning sick from active service could be placed in marquees during the summer months, and such accommodation would be highly appreciated.

Mr. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) thought the hon. Member for St. Pancras had somewhat under-rated the accommodation at Netley. In the discussion on that institution last session it was made apparent that there were 900 beds vacant in Netley hospital, there never being more than 300 of the beds occupied. If it was the desire of the Government to accommodate soldiers and sailors of the non-commissioned ranks there was plenty of room for doing so at Netley. This munificent gift having been made to to the nation for the purpose of a convalescent home for officers as well as a training college for naval cadets, there ought to be no question as to the hygienic conditions of the buildings. Some years ago a Commission of eminent medical men inquired into those conditions, and reported very unfavourably in regard to the water supply and some of the buildings. As a rumour had been circulated that the health of the boys at Osborne had not been very good he would be glad to hear that the recommendations of the Commission had been carried out.

*Mr. HARCOURT said there appeared to have been a considerable amount of confusion in the minds of hon. Members in regard to the expenditure at Osborne. The training college for boys for the Navy was not under his Office but under the Admiralty, and all his Office was concerned with was the erection of the building. When Osborne House was taken over the drainage was found to be very bad, but the whole system had since been remodelled, and the main sewer replaced. It was now in a perfectly sanitary condition suitable for the highest requirements of a convalescent hospital. Special pains had been taken to secure a good water supply. The old wells were not being used; a special supply had been secured. As to the use of this hospital by officers only, hon. Members had apparently forgotten the conditions of the Royal gift. Undoubtedly the country received a magnificent gift, but it was made on certain terms embodied in the Osborne Estates Act of 1902. Under that Act a part of the House and the grounds were to be kept in their present state as a memorial to Her late Majesty the Queen, but the remainder was to be devoted to the purposes of a Convalescent Home for officers of the Navy and Army. That accounted for the way Osborne had been administered, and he thought its administration had been most successful. Those hon. Members who had had experience of hospitals generally would agree with him that the expenditure had not been extravagant. He felt sure that anyone who had visited the hospital and seen the patients would not begrudge the money spent upon the obvious advantages which the forces of the Crown were receiving. No less than 330 patients passed through the Home in the year 1906-7, an increase of thirty over the previous year, and eighty-eight over the year 1904-5. He reminded the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London that the expenditure covered not only the upkeep of the Convalescent Home, but also the maintenance and custody of the State Apartments and Museum and grounds, all of which were open to the public. It was a very large place to look after, and it was visited every year by some 60,000 or 70,000 persons.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.) asked for further information in regard to the £850 for "work incidental to the discontinuance of electric generating and change over to a supply from the company's mains."

*MR. HARCOURT reminded the hon. Member that that was an item in last year's Estimates. There had been a considerable fall in the maintenance expenses, amounting to £235, and that was a direct result of the change.

SIR F. BANBURY thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his reply, and said he was not aware that the grounds were open to the public. He was quite as anxious as hon. Members opposite that every facility should be given for the admission of private soldiers to convalescent homes, but it would not be possible to deal with them at Osborne House.

MR. MORTON called attention to the item of £85 for the travelling expenses of the Osborne Advisory Committee and Consulting Staff. As for the lack of facilities offered to the private soldier——

*The CHAIRMAN: The question of facilities for the private soldier is out of order. Had I known the terms of the Act of Parliament I should not have allowed the previous discussion on that point.

MR. MORTON asked for an explanation of the sum of money spent upon the Osborne Advisory Committee.

*MR. HARCOURT said the Advisory Committee consisted of very eminent surgeons who gave their services and made periodical visits to the institution to satisfy him that the Convalescent Home was being properly conducted. These surgeons examined the patients, and he thought the least the Government could do was to pay their travelling expenses seeing that they gave their services. He could not speak too highly of the valuable services which these men had given most willingly.

Vote agreed to.

3. £50,700, to complete the sum for Diplomatic and Consular buildings.

SIR F. BANBURY called attention to an item of £11,000 for the erection of a new consulate at Cairo, and stated that the original estimate was £6,000. If a proper estimate had been made at first, why should an increase of nearly 100 per cent. have been necessary? An item of £51,600 for the acquisition of a new Embassy House at Madrid, and for alterations to the house and stables, showed an increase of £11,600 on the original estimate. That seemed to be a large amount for the house of the Ambassador at Madrid. It was not easy to know exactly what would be the final cost of a new building unless a very careful estimate was made, but in this case it was not a new building. Before the house was bought the Government should have known what they were going to pay for it. The amount of the item seemed to him to be extremely large and to require explanation.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON, referring to an item of £830 for the maintenance and repair of certain cemeteries abroad, asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was satisfied that the sum was sufficient for the careful and sympathetic maintenance of the cemeteries. From time to time complaints were made in the public Press and otherwise as to the neglect of these cemeteries. That was very painful to persons who had relatives or friends buried in these cemeteries. He thought it was discreditable to this country if the cemeteries were not properly and sympathetically looked after. He would be very glad to have some reassurance from the right hon. Gentleman on that point.

*MR. MORTON also asked an assurance from his right hon. friend that these cemeteries were being kept up in a decent and proper manner. He had received private information that at several places that was not the case. He would like to know why they were asked to vote £51,600 for a house and stables at Madrid, and £11,000 for the erection of a new consulate at Cairo. One would have thought that with the income-tax at a shilling in the pound a great many of the places mentioned in the Vote might have waited for a few years before large sums of money were spent on them. If the people of Sutherlandshire wanted money for necessary improvements they could not get a penny, but consulates abroad could get money voted by the £100,000.

*MR. HARCOURT said he heartily sympathised with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken. Owing to the pressure of the war expenditure the items before the Committee were kept down to the lowest possible amount. These places had been waiting for many years, and many of them were in such a scandalous condition that they could wait no longer. No effort was being spared to effect economies, but if we were to have ambassadors abroad they must be provided with proper dwellings. As to the increase in the cost of the Cairo Consulate the item was not so unsatisfactory as it looked on the paper. The first estimate was not made on a detailed plan or specification. It was a rough, and more or less speculative, estimate made by the consul; but when a proper estimate was made it was found that more money would have to be spent. At Madrid not only had the house to be acquired, but a good deal of money had to be spent on the necessary alterations. The adaptation of the house was more expensive than was originally expected. The furniture in the house was found to be absolutely unsuitable for the purpose for which the building was purchased. In reply to the hon. Members who had called attention to the cemeteries, he had to say that there appeared to be a little confusion as to the cemeteries which were under the charge of his Department. Some of the cemeteries abroad were not under the charge of the Department at all. The cemeteries of which they had charge were at Athens, Bayonne, and on the Bosphorus; in China, Japan, Corea, and Siam; in the Ionian Islands; Cathcart's Hill, Crimea; Gallipoli; the Piraeus; and at Suakim. He had not personally received complaints in regard to any of these cemeteries, but he hoped that any hon. Members who got complaints would bring them to his notice in order that he might see that proper and reverent attention was paid to them.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked whether in estimating the cost of the new consulate at Stanleyville at £4,000 the fact that labour was cheap had been taken into consideration. In the Vote there was a small item for the new house for the assistant Japanese secretary at Tokio, and he would like to know from the right hon. Gentleman if the amount put on the Estimates for the buildings represented the real money spent on them. The policy of the Government in regard to the provision of good consulate houses was one which ought to commend itself to both Parties in the House. There was an item for a new Legation House at Adis Abeba, in Abysinnia, and he could not see that that could be objected to. It might be advocated that rough and ready houses ought to be sufficient for our consuls in these days of economy, but wherever the representatives of Germany and France went they attempted to impress the natives with the importance of their position and of the countries they represented. All over the world he found that Germany especially, and France, but not the United States, who were in European rivalry for prestige amongst semi-civilised or semi-savage countries, spent money lavishly so as to impress the natives. He, therefore, believed that the policy of the Government was wise, and if the right hon. Gentleman came down next year requesting £5,000 or £10,000 for Consulates in the Congo Free State he would support him. Our Ministers and Consuls abroad, especially in semi-savage tropical countries, ought to be provided with the very best accommodation possible—for that at the best was very poor comfort for their exile.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that there was an item of £5,000 for the erection of a new Legation House at Adis Abeba. Why was it called a Legation? He understood that our representative was only of the rank of a Consulate-General. The hon. Member for Gravesend had said that our representatives were never so well housed as the Ministers of Germany and France.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that he had not stated that our Ministers were badly housed, but that they were often not so well housed as those of Germany and France.

*MR. REES said he agreed that the nations named made much of their representatives, but at Teheran no one was housed like our own Minister. He presumed that the new premises in the estimates were erected in the Legation Compound, and it was hardly conceivable that £5,000 should have been spent on additions to the small garden house at Gulahek. In regard to Persia, it was not said in the Estimates what India contributed towards the very handsome palace at Teheran. He would like to know how much was paid by the Indian Government towards the upkeep of that luxurious palace and how much India contributed towards the building expenses.

SIR F. BANBURY said that the First Commissioner of Works had deplored the increase in the expenditure on the buildings at Cairo and Madrid, but that the Estimate had not been made on specification, and therefore could not be relied on. In regard to Madrid, it was said that after the house had been bought it was found that the alterations necessary to make it suitable for an Embassy were much greater than was originally expected; but he did not think that the answer of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the new Consulate at Cairo was satisfactory. What he wanted to know was who was responsible for the Estimates, and for the supervision of the works? Who was responsible for proper contracts being obtained and for seeing that the works were carried out in a proper manner? It would almost appear as if the repairs to, and the erection of, Embassies and Consulates abroad were carried on in a haphazard manner, and without proper supervision. The right hon. Gentleman might say that those buildings were being carried on all over the face of the globe, and that it would be impossible—certainly very expensive—to have a permanent staff to supervise them. He did not know what happened in Persia, but he knew Cairo and Madrid; and it seemed to him that it might have been possible to obtain native professional talent to supervise the works at those places which involved an expenditure of such a large amount of money. That raised the point as to whether under these circumstances it would not be better to hire houses for British Embassies and Consulates instead of buying them.

MR. REES: The houses do not exist in most cases.

SIR F. BANBURY said they did exist in Madrid and Cairo. He had already stated that he did not know anything about Persia; but surely in all European countries it would be easy to hire a building, and he was perfectly right in saying that even now a very large number of houses for Consulates were hired and not purchased. He noticed that Japan was the only instance in which the estimates for construction and addition had been adhered to. He further called attention to the fact that the large sum of £47,000 was put down under the head of "minor works" for the "acquisition of sites and buildings and works in connection therewith." Of that sum the Vote required for 1907–8 was £20,000. They had had no statement of what that meant, and he hoped they would have one from the First Commissioner of Works.

*MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) trusted the right hon. Gentleman would not listen to the seductive suggestion of the hon. Baronet that he should hire these buildings instead of acquiring them. As anyone who had any knowledge of the matter knew, it was infinitely better in the long run for this country to buy than to hire. In other countries the interest on money borrowed for building purposes was very high, not less than 8 to 10 per cent., whereas in this country it would be 2½ to 3 per cent. It was, therefore, infinitely better for the Government of this country to build or buy a house in St. Petersburg, for instance, than to hire it.

SIR F. BANBURY inquired what would happen in the case of a revolution?

*MR. ANNAN BRYCE said that Russia was a civilised country, and he supposed that the Government could insure there as well as here. He also called attention to three Votes for the erection of Vice-Consulate buildings in Siam. One was at Chiengmai, a very important place with a Consul of high standing in the Civil Service living there. There were a great number of British subjects, and a judge who was a member of a mixed court. The total estimate for these buildings was, however, only £350. At Laken the total estimate was £650, the probable expenditure till 31st March, 1907, being £300, and the Vote required for 1907–8 £350. At Phré again, the original total estimate was £650; the Vote required for 1907–8 was £350, and the further amount required for completing the service was £300. None of the sums to be spent upon these establishments could possibly be adequate for the proper accommodation of His Majesty's servants in the places mentioned. He asked, therefore, whether they were the total amounts which it was proposed to spend.

SIR GILBERT PARKER thought the Committee were entitled to some further explanation as to the new Consulate at Cairo, and as to the expenditure to which the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London had called attention. The original Estimate was £6,000, but the revised total was £11,000, a difference of £5,000. He asked whether the increase was due to the acquisition of land after the Estimate was framed, because the cost of land had gone up tremendously in Cairo during the last five years, and prices had become very inflated. All these differences showed a lack of sufficient care in framing the Estimates, and at any rate, a little light on the subject would be useful. His hon. friend the Member for the City of London had raised important questions as to the acquisition of a number of sites and buildings and works in connection therewith, involving the expenditure of a very large sum indeed, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give them details in regard to those sites and buildings. The amount was put down at the bottom of the list, and no doubt it was deemed insignificant, but £47,000 was a very large sum indeed, and he thought they were justified in asking for a full statement with regard to it. Then there was a sum for allowances to certain Ministers. What Ministers? No one wanted to deprive any Ministers, insufficiently paid as they were, of any allowances which might be required, but he thought some explanation was necessary. The allowances seemed to be traditional, and were allotted in addition to the Minister's usual salary. The Estimates were very useful, as they gave them a clear knowledge of what was going on in Government Departments, and he thought they were fully justified in spending some time in debating them, as by that means they brought out what otherwise would not be made clear. Of course, the First Commissioner wished to get his Votes as soon as possible, but he urged his hon. friends not to be deterred from pressing the right hon. Gentleman by any idea that they might be erroneously described as obstructionists.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) desired to know the method that was adopted to arrive at the improvements that were necessary in the different buildings. Who decided that extra accommodation was necessary? By what method was it decided where was the best site? Was the selection made by some officer of the Consulate or by some special officer sent out from this country? He would also like to know who drew the plans of the buildings to be erected, and whether the plans were submitted to the Office of Works and investigated to see that the Estimates approached accuracy. He thought the Committee would have more confidence in the Estimates if they knew the method employed by the Office of Works in preparing and checking them.

*MR. REES asked, in connection with the Vote for radiators installed at St. Petersburg, whether the building occupied by the Embassy had now become the property of the nation. When he lived at Petersburg the British Ambassador occupied a portion of the Soltikoff Palace, but as money was being spent by the State on this portion of a private house, perhaps the Government had since purchased the front upon the Palace quay? If the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London knew many of these places for which provision was made in the list under consideration he would not, he was sure, suggest that buildings should be hired. Having a good deal of knowledge of many of these houses he could only say that they were not in any way beyond the necessities of the case. It was only in the case of Teheran that our representative was housed in a conspicuously suitable manner. Probably that was because India contributed to the cost. He did not believe that further knowledge of these places would lead to the belief that more money than was necessary was being spent upon them.

Mr. HARCOURT, replying to the hon. Member for Stoke, said that the method of deciding upon the sites required for these buildings was, in the first place, by means of communications by letter between the people on the spot and his office. Therefore, they had before them, often for many years, knowledge of the sites which were available, and those which were suitable. When that preliminary had been decided the plans were drawn in his office, and bills of quantities were prepared. The Estimates were made before he was able to make a contract, as he could not put out a request for tenders and accept a contract until he had Parliamentary authority. Before that, however, he had to hand into the Treasury a rough estimate of what he thought was necessary. The hon. Baronet had talked about the contracts of private individuals and firms, but very often in those cases the estimates were largely exceeded. In every case the Government had their own clerk of the works in charge of the building, and in most cases they had the benefit of the services of an architect, generally one of their own staff, during the course of construction. He thought that every precaution was taken in the matter, but of course the Committee would realise that it was more difficult to build at such a distance than at home. In many foreign countries local contractors would not give them a firm contract for a lump sum, but they were perfectly willing to work on schedule prices, and therefore the Department had to proceed very carefully in framing the schedule. He agreed that the amount put down on the Estimate for the expenditure at Chiengrai was insufficient, but the total amount was £750, and the balance came from Indian sources. Exception had been taken by the junior Member for the City to the item for the acquisition of sites and buildings in different parts of the world. He did not expect that that item would escape the vigilance of the hon. Baronet, and he had rather hoped he would be asked about it. The concealment it implied was quite intentional. It was necessary for the Government to purchase sites in different parts of the world, and if he were to indicate the places where the Government proposed to purchase the price of the land would be raised against him. Therefore he was compelled to ask the Committee to trust him to that extent. The hon. Baronet had also referred to an item for the maintenance and repairs of buildings, expressing the opinion that the amount was large. He would point out to the hon. Gentleman that the number of buildings which we had to maintain and repair in various parts of the world was also very large. The hon. Member had drawn attention to the fact that that item included not only structural repairs but also new works. The new works under this head were extremely few; they were very small and absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the buildings. He himself was responsible for most of the contracts. Of course before a contract was entered into rough estimates had to be obtained, and other persons might be asked to supply those estimates; but the contracts were all drawn up by the Government architect. He did not agree with the hon. Baronet that the Government would do well to hire houses in these places instead of purchasing them. It was in his opinion most desirable that this country should own its own embassies and houses of that kind. The saving by purchase as against hire was enormous. In many of these places there was no house which could be hired suitable for an embassy. Private houses had no chancellories attached to them. It was much more dignified and economic to own houses for diplomatic purposes. Referring to the questions of the Member for Montgomery Boroughs, our representative at Adis Abeba was now a Minister, the extra buildings at Teheran were at Gulahek, and the embassy at Petersburg was still a private building, though that was no reason why we should freeze our Ambassador. Perhaps the radiators were capable of removal if required.

Sir W. EVANS GORDON thought the right hon. Gentleman, when he replied with regard to the upkeep of the cemeteries in South Africa, did not quite appreciate the point which had been put. The right hon. Gentleman had said that if complaints were received with regard to the upkeep of those cemeteries he would be glad to inquire into the matter. What he really desired to ask was whether the right hon. Gentleman was satisfied that the sum of £830 was sufficient for the purpose for which it was allotted, and whether it was properly distributed. He hoped the First Commissioner would satisfy himself that the persons who were carrying out the work in the different parts were proper people for the work, and the wages they received were adequate. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that in the case of buildings for diplomatic purposes purchase was by far more economical than hiring.

SIR F. BANBURY said the Estimates for building these large houses in different parts seemed to have been exceeded in every case before them, and all he had said was that it might possibly be wise to consider the question of hiring houses as well as the question of building them.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: The hon. Baronet went somewhat further than that.

SIR F. BANBURY said it had not been his intention to do so. The hon. Member opposite had alluded to St. Petersburg, but there, the right hon. Gentleman said, the house was hired.

*MR. ANNAN BRYCE: And in other places as well as in St. Petersburg.

SIR. F. BANBURY said it was really a matter of business. If they could buy more cheaply let them buy; if it was cheaper to hire let them hire. He was concerned for economy. He did not care about dignity. There were a great many places abroad which at very little expense could be adapted to their purposes. There were many old palaces which belonged to the ancient nobility in different cities of Europe. They would not part with them under any circumstances, but not being able to live in them, they would be only too glad if some one would occupy them and keep them in repair.

*MR. MORTON said the complaint about exceeding the Estimates was a very old one, and it certainly was an extraordinary way of conducting business. Any private firm managing its business in that way could not long keep out of the Bankruptcy Court. He would mention only one or two items. The cost of the Cairo buildings, up to date, exceeded by about 90 per cent. what the Committee were led to expect when the undertaking was entered upon. In the case of the building at Amoy the Estimate was exceeded by 50 per cent. It was hardly fair that the Government should ask the Committee for money if they did not keep nearer to the Estimates. He was not blaming the right hon. Gentleman, who was not responsible for these Estimates. It was the previous Government which had got them into this trouble. He knew, also, that they could not expect Estimates to be absolutely adhered to, but he thought they ought to keep within 10 per cent. of them. He asked what was the meaning of the item of £5,000 for the reconstruction of the Chancery at Paris. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that it was not intended to keep up all the cemeteries in South Africa, and he would be glad to know the names of those which it was intended to keep in order. He was bound to say that, whatever number of cemeteries there were in South Africa or elsewhere for the interment of our soldiers and sailors, they ought to be kept up by this country. If the right hon. Gentleman would state what cemeteries he intended to keep up in South Africa, it might render it unnecessary for anyone to make complaints, because certain of the cemeteries would not be under the control of the Government at all. He thought it was always right, when they had the opportunity, to criticise the Estimates, because it was so easy to spend other people's money. It was remarkably easy to call upon them to give £6,000 for a public building, and then to come down upon them afterwards and say "we want £11,000." He would like to see public business carried on at least as carefully as private business.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) in regard to the building at Cairo, the Estimate for which, he said, had been nearly doubled, pointed out that the value of land at Cairo was very much inflated at the present time. Recently land had been sold in Cairo at a price per foot greater than had ever been paid in London, except in the City. The Committee would agree that such a price was not likely to be continued for any length of time. Therefore, would it not be possible, even at this late hour, to wait until the price of land had fallen? In that way a certain amount of money would probably be saved, and he did not suppose the Consular Service would be very much hurt.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) agreed with the hon. Member for Gravesend as to the erection of Consular buildings in the Congo Free State, on which they were going to spend £8,000. He suggested that the buildings should be constructed of strong and substantial material, because it was not unlikely that they might be used as places of refuge. He wished to make an inquiry as to the Consular building at Dakar, on which it was proposed to spend £7,476. They were putting up one at Monrovia; not very far off, which was to cost £3,500. Dakar was a place, he believed, where a certain number of ships were signalled; it was a French port, and he did not think there was much English shipping there, at any rate. He desired to know what reason there was for a Consular building of the magnitude proposed. Reference had been made to the expenditure of £5,000 on the Chancery of the Paris Embassy. It had cost an enormous sum of money in the past, and was one of our finest buildings. He did not know what the reason was for the reconstruction of the Chancery, but he confessed the item surprised him, because the Paris Embassy was one which most of them had seen and admired, and was considered the most complete under the British flag.

*MR. HARCOURT said he quite agreed as to the Embassy at Paris being one of the finest in the world, but the Chancery was thoroughly unsuitable for the work which was done there, and it was essential, where so much work had to be carried out, and where the pressure was so great, that accommodation should be provided in order to enable its being conducted under proper and business-like conditions. The hon. Member for Blackpool had asked about the Consular building at Cairo, and had spoken rather as if the Government were going into the market to buy land. He was aware that the price of land was high, but in this case the site was already bought, and it would be most wasteful to keep it vacant and not to put up a Consular building which would meet all requirements. The hon. Member for Sutherland had asked a question with regard to the excess on the estimate for the building at Amoy. It had been necessary to reconstruct a portion of the building, as part of the woodwork had been destroyed by white ants.

Vote agreed to.

4. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £427,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908, for the Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office, and Post Office Telegraph Buildings in Great Britain, and certain Post Offices abroad, including Furniture, Fuel, and sundry Miscellaneous Services."

SIR F. BANBURY said he was sorry to see that in connection with this Vote there was an increase in every item but two. The Vote was for a large sum and it was very strange that a Government pledged to economy should find it necessary to increase every item but two. The original Estimates had been very much exceeded, and although there might be considerable force in what the right hon. Gentleman had said about it being extremely difficult to supervise works carried out in foreign countries, that argument did not apply to works in this country. For example, at Sunderland the original estimate for a Customs Building was £1,500, whilst the revised estimate was £2,150, or an increase of £650. That was a very large increase on such a small amount. At Southampton £6,950 was required for the erection of new Inland Revenue offices under the original estimate, but the revised total estimate was £8,450. For the Blackfriars new power station for the General Post Office the original total estimate was £40,000, and the revised estimate £48,500; and for Post Office buildings at Hull the original estimate was £40,000 and the revised estimate £58,000. He noticed that in the case of the Gloucester (George St.) Branch P.O. extension the original estimate was £51,800 and the revised estimate £5,920.

*MR. HARCOURT: That is a misprint. There is a cipher too many, and the amount should be £5,180.

SIR F. BANBURY said that at Newport the orginal estimate for a new Post Office was £24,850, whilst the revised estimate was £31,000. In almost every case the estimates were nothing like accurate. Post Office buildings were simple business buildings, and it ought to be perfectly easy to obtain reasonably accurate estimates for them. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give them some assurance that in the future greater care would be exercised in the preparation of Estimates. He invited hon. Members opposite who were pledged to economy to support him in his desire to have these works carried out in a business-like manner. He would moved to reduce the Vote by £100.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £426,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

*MR. HARCOURT explained that the original estimates were only provisional and approximate, and it was not until Parliamentary authority was obtained that they prepared the detailed specification on which the contract was made. They arrived at the best estimate they could, but they were obliged to make a speculative estimate. The Blackfriars power station was to provide an electric supply for the Central Post Office. For the Post Office buildings at Hull the original estimate was only a provisional one. In the case of Sunderland it was simply a readjustment of several offices under the same roof.

MR. ASHLEY called attention to an item of £1,000 for the new post office at Blackpool. That work had been a long time overdue. In the season he himself had had the greatest difficulty in getting attended to, not on account of the staff, but because the accommodation was inadequate. He impressed on the right hon. Gentleman that, if he was only going to spend £1,000 in the current financial year, he ought to give a promise of a considerably larger amount next year.

MR. WARD pointed out that the building programme of post offices and other public buildings had been considerably delayed owing largely to the scarcity of money caused by the war. There was at present in nearly all Departments enormous arrears in building operations. Many of the office buildings were in nothing like the condition necessary for effective and efficient work. He had seen defective and inadequate buildings all over the country. There was room for very considerable improvement all round. The House of Commons voted millions of pounds for works of destruction without criticism, and if it was proposed to throw money away on useless objects it was always possible to get support for such expenditure. But when it came to the question of building or increasing the wealth of the nation by public works, any amount of pettifogging criticism was made about little details not worth considering. As a matter of fact he thought that the building programme of the Government was especially disappointing considering how good the present time was for such work. The building trade was depressed all over the country. Thousands of workmen were out of employment. Contractors found themselves without work to do. Now, therefore, was the time when the Government ought to try to make up leeway for the omissions of the last ten years and for circumstances over which the present Administration had no control. He was quite sure that the Committee would be very pleased to vote money for works of public utility—considerably larger sums than those specified in the Vote—if they were satisfied that the works were required. In his opinion, considering the position of the building trade and the amount of unemployment, the criticism directed against the First Commissioner of Works should have been not that the Vote was too large, but in the direction of trying to induce him to increase the expenditure. He would be glad if the right hon. Gentleman would tell the Committee what he proposed to do next year to make up the leeway which undoubtedly existed in the building programme of Government Departments.

If the statement were not satisfactory he would be inclined as a protest to support the Motion for reduction.

MR. C. E. PRICE said post office extension in Edinburgh was a matter which needed to be dealt with. He urged that the work should be pressed forward for the simple reason that there were at the present moment a large number of men connected with the building trade unemployed in that city. He would have been better pleased if the Vote for this year had been larger in amount. By pressing on the work with all speed great relief would be given to the tradesmen.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that a few weeks ago a correspondence was placed in his hands which had taken place between a certain authority in his own constituency and the Board of Works. It had been suggested by hon. Gentlemen opposite that there was carelessness in drawing up the Estimates, but that correspondence showed that, so far from that being the case, the right hon. Gentleman and the members of his Staff gave great attention to the details of the Estimates, and if he had been attending to his own business, he could not have exercised greater economy, or taken greater interest in the matter than he did. He thought it was only fair that that should be stated.

* MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) called attention to an item for the post office at Dumbarton, and asked how that matter stood. It had been under consideration for some time. About a year ago the Post Office had in contemplation a site which would not have met with the approval of the people of the burgh. It was considered that that site would prove inconvenient, and that it was not in the direction towards which the burgh was extending. He would like to be informed whether that site had been selected, or whether a new site had been settled upon. If they looked through the list of proposed works in this Vote, it would be seen that the allowance to Scotland was by no means so large as it ought to be, and that seemed to him a reason for generous treatment as regarded post office accommodation at Dumbarton.

SIR F. BANBURY said that hon. Gentlemen below the gangway seemed to have the war on the brain. It was said that owing to the war building work was in arrear. It would be out of order to enter into discussion with the hon. Member for Stoke upon the question of spending money for destructive purposes, but he might say that he and his friends, being anxious that peace should be preserved, thought that the best way of providing for peace was to have a strong Navy. He had never questioned the right of the First Commissioner to provide the proposed new works. What he criticised was the bringing forward of an Estimate of £40,000, and then a revised Estimate of £58,000 for the same work. He always understood that the hon. Member for Stoke was an apostle of economy. It was not economy to spend £58,000 if they could get the same work done for £40,000. He disagreed with the First Commissioner when he said that it was difficult to get an accurate estimate. The building of a post office was not a new thing, and it should be perfectly easy for an architect to make a proper estimate. Hon. Members below the gangway did not seem to grasp a fundamental principle in the governing of a great country. If they wished to manage a great country, or a great business, economically, they must look into all the items. It was in small items that extravagance occurred. It was necessary that the heads of the great departments should bear in mind that their Estimates would be freely criticised in the Committee. He did not blame the officials; they were not dealing with their own money, and unless there was criticism they might be tempted to save themselves trouble by putting on a little extra cost. He was not satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the increase of this item. He could not conceive that there should be any great difficulty in arriving at a fairly accurate estimate. Probably the estimate was correct, but the contract was excessive. He expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would not be led away by the airy sentiment of the hon. Member for Stoke. Hon. Members were there to see that the nation got a sovereign's worth for a sovereign; and they had no right to spend 25s. in getting a sovereign's worth.

* Mr. HARCOURT said that the hon. Member for the City of London had apparently not considered how great was the variation in the sites and requirements of the post offices in different towns all over the country. The hon. Member seemed to think that post offices were cut out to one pattern, as if they were so many Noah's arks in a toy shop. The hon. Member for Dumbarton had spoken of the site of the post office of that town. He was quite aware that that matter had not been settled, but he hoped that it would be soon. The hon. Member for the City of London said that they had got "war on the brain"; but he entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Stoke as to the financial effects of the war. The Office of Works was rather the Cinderella of the Departments, and when there was that great and, in his opinion, unnecessary expenditure on war, his office suffered most by having all its Estimates cut down, so that building fell into arrear. He had added £30,000 to the building Vote this year, and it was because he was making up those arrears of buildings that he was attacked by hon. Members opposite. To the hon. Member for Stoke he would say that he had taken as much as he could for building, and that he must spread his zeal for building over the years he might be allowed to control it. At any rate, he had no desire to limit the occupation which would be afforded to workmen in the erection of these buildings. The hon. Member for Blackpool was not such a rigid economist as his neighbour the hon. Member for the City of London, and he had complained that the Office of Works had been too modest in beginning a post office suitable for the correspondence which no doubt took place between the hon. Member and that town. He had provided the usual sum for the foundations of the new post office at Blackpool, and when these were laid the building would proceed more rapidly. It might be some consolation to the hon. Member, at least, that they had got a Government in office which had paid attention to the demands of Blackpool, and had not neglected them in a manner which, according to the hon. Member, had been the custom of the previous Government.

Sir W. EVANS GORDON asked the right hon. Gentleman whether his attention had been called to the post office building situated opposite the new Victoria and Albert Museum buildings. He was glad to think that that post office was to be enlarged, but he desired to call attention to the deplorable condition of the site, which adjoined an old wooden shanty that might be a positive danger to the post office building. He asked whether the £1,200 on the Estimates for the enlargement of the post office there was sufficient to secure the erection of a suitable building for that neighbourhood?

Mr. ASHLEY said he had asked the right hon. Gentleman how long it would be before the new post office at Blackpool would be completed. It was estimated to cost £15,000, but there was only £1,000 this year on the Estimates for it. He did not think that his constituents would be so grateful to the Government as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine. They asked for bread and he gave them a stone. At the present rate it would take fifteen years to get the post office completed.

*Mr. HARCOURT said that the hon. Member evidently did not understand building operations. A post office took about two years to build, and he hoped to complete the Blackpool post office in about eighteen months, after the completion of the foundations, although he could give no pledge as to the exact time it would take. As to the remark of the hon. Member for Stepney in regard to the branch post office opposite the Victoria and Albert Museum, he believed that the building would be suitable.

*Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) objected to the reply which the right hon. Gentleman had given to the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London in regard to the extraordinary excess of expenditure over the estimate in connection with the post office at Hull. The state of things entirely warranted everything the hon. Baronet had said of it, and the explanation which the right hon. Gentleman had given did not meet the case at all. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London evidently fancied that post

Sir F. Banbury.

offices could be turned out *en bloc* or punched out in any quantity; but there was no question of comic opera about the supply of post offices, and his hon. friend was entitled to a serious reply. He, however, got nothing from the right hon. Gentleman but a reflection upon his ideas of building. They all knew that, given a certain state of things and certain requirements, it ought easily to be within the capacity of the right hon. Gentleman so to arrange his estimate that it was much nearer the actual cost than was represented by fifty-eight as comparedwith forty. There must have been some very gross error in the quantities, and he thought the Committee were entitled to learn how the error arose before they voted this large sum of money, which was altogether disproportionate to the services rendered. If a certain site was selected for a post office there ought to be no difficulty about the matter, because it was perfectly well known what the requirements were, having regard to the number of letters, telegrams, parcels and newspapers to be dealt with. There was no difficulty at all in arriving at an accurate estimate, but instead of that they had, as in the case of Hull, a vast expenditure over the estimate. The hon. Member for Stoke had said that the building trade was in a depressed condition, but they would like to have some information on that point. He did not think it was in a depressed condition in many parts of the country. In the last week he had wanted a dozen men for building purposes within twenty miles of the House, and had been unable to get them, and he was not sure that the same condition of things did not prevail in other parts of the country. He therefore thought the hon. Member for Stoke was exaggerating, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give them some well-thought-out answer on the subject, such as would satisfy reasonable persons. So far, however, up to the present, from the inquiry of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London having received the consideration which it deserved, they had been treated in a light, although kindly and genial manner, and had been given no information at all.

*Mr. HARCOURT regretted that the hon. Member was dissatisfied with his reply, because he thought he had clearly pointed out that in the case of Hull several difficulties had arisen in regard to the foundations. Everybody who had had to do with building knew that in certain cases unexpected difficulties as to foundations occurred when the excavations for that purpose were made. He might point out, moreover, that the Hull estimates were made under the old bad system of rough estimates before taking a Vote of the House. He was so much impressed with the badness of that method that about twelve months ago he gave orders that the estimates should be made much closer than they had been before.

Mr. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate) associated himself with the suggestion of the hon. Member for Stoke that in times when the building trade was depressed, there should be as far as possible increase of expenditure upon public works.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 33; Noes. 174. (Division List No. 100.)

AYES.

Baldwin, Alfred
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, Sir W. Evans-(T'r Ham.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'd
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Ashley.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith,Rt.Hn. HerbertHenry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(S'merset
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,R'mf'rd
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,RtHnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey,W.E (Derbyshire,N.E
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,JWynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price,C.E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton underLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strauss, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke uponTrent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White,J.D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Sir ThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

5. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £313,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain, not provided for on other Votes."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS asked for a statement as to the erection of official residences for the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Senior Naval Lord in lieu of existing residences. This item in the Estimates, he understood, referred to the building now being erected at the end of the new processional avenue—or rather, the continuation of the old Mall. He desired an assurance that the work would be proceeded with upon the plan approved by the late Government, although the amount asked for the year was small. He was certain that such a building was the only proper termination to the avenue, because the alignment of the Mall was at an unfortunate angle at Charing Cross, and therefore the only proper way of terminating the avenue was to have a building of the kind proposed facing Buckingham Palace in the way suggested. He also desired some explanation in reference to the £5,000 on account for extension of the National Gallery over part of the barracks site. The total estimated cost was not ascertained, but it would be remembered that the removal of the old St. George's Barracks had often been discussed, as it was generally considered they were a source of danger from fire to the national collection. He supposed that it would not be possible to remove the whole of the buildings, but he hoped that the removal would include the dangerous part. Another item of interest was £1,500 for the casting and erection of the statue, "Physical Energy," by the late Mr. G. F. Watts, R.A., the model of which was lent to the nation. He would be glad to know how the work of casting was proceeding, whether it was likely to be finished in the present year, and what site had been selected for its erection. He observed that an amount of £5,000 was set down for a new Stationery Office warehouse, but the total cost had not been ascertained. Why was that? Where was the warehouse to be erected? He hoped the mistake would not be made of taking expensive land in the neighbourhood of the Stationery Office, for there was no necessity for that in these days of telephonic communication. He noticed that a beginning had been made with the arch which was to connect the new with the old buildings for the Local Government Board. That means of communication met with general approval when the designs were exhibited, and it was felt that the arch would do much to hide the difference in the street alignment. He was glad to find there was no truth in the rumour that the arch was to be abandoned.

*MR. HARCOURT said in reference to the new wing of the Admiralty which the right hon. Gentleman had described as at the end of the processional avenue—a word he hoped would never be adopted as describing the new thoroughfare——

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had no intention of so describing it.

*MR. HARCOURT hoped it would always retain the old, the historic name, "The Mall." The foundations of the new buildings were finished, and the superstructure was now rising in accordance with the original plans. He was pleased to get the Vote for the National Gallery upon the Estimates in the present year, for it marked an advance in a policy the Board of Works had in the past been very anxious to follow. The National Gallery would be much safer, and there would be space to extend it westwards for the reception of many art additions. The Vote would pledge the Government to the removal of part of the barracks, now a source of danger and a disfigurement upon a space that would be available for extension of the Gallery. He had himself a plan for the removal of the recruiting depot also, but for reasons the right hon. Gentleman would appreciate he would not go into that. The casting in bronze of the statue "Physical Energy," by the late Mr. Watts, had taken longer than had been anticipated, but it was being proceeded with. He wished to explain that a sort of implied promise he made last year that the statue should be erected on the bridge at the end of the Serpentine could not possibly be carried out. He had some doubt as to the scale of the statue, as compared with the bidge, and had had drawings made to scale and shown on the bridge. They were ludicrously out of proportion, and after consulting Lord Plymouth and others it was obvious that the statue could not be placed there, apart from the heavy structural and engineering expenditure involved. On further consideration he thought he would be able to find a very good site where the statue would have a dignified and appropriate position, somewhere in the broad avenue from the Serpentine to the Round Pond, Kensington Gardens. He had not been able to give the full estimate for the Stationery Office warehouse, but he wished again to say that, in pursuance of a policy similar to that applied to the National Gallery, the warehouse would not be placed, as was originally intended, at the back of the Tate Gallery. The land there would be left for the possible extension of the Tate Gallery, and the warehouse would be erected in Elverton Street, Westminster. As to the arch over Charles Street, though there was a rumour that a wicked Radical Government and an unappreciative First Commissioner had decided to knock out that portion of the design, there was no truth in the rumour. The original design would be carried out, except that in the statuary some few details had been altered after consultation with the architect. There would be no departure from the original design.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on his extremely satisfactory statement, especially with regard to the National Gallery. In reference to the statue by the late Mr. G. F. Watts, it had always struck him that the site proposed for it was unsuitable, and that it would be entirely out of proportion to the place. He was glad, therefore, that the matter had been left over for a time, though he did not commit himself to approval of the suggestion which the right hon. Gentleman was considering as to a site in the Broad Walk. He was quite certain that the proportions of the statue in relation to the original site would have been entirely wrong, and the work would have been anything but an improvement there. With regard to the arch over Charles Street, the right hon. Gentleman's answer was again satisfactory. He understood that while they were going to carry out the arch they proposed to modify the idea of the statuary above it. He was certainly satisfied with the information which the right hon. Gentleman had given, because he thought it was quite possible that, on reconsideration, some modification would be found to be desirable.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) called attention to the charges for insurance on buildings, his object being to ascertain why these amounts were spent at all, in which offices the insurances were effected, and what properties. Another general subject to which he wished to call attention had reference to the matter of furniture. A sum of over £9,000 was taken for furniture. Was there any arrangement in the Office of Works by which it was ensured that all the furniture purchased was made in England, and that the work was fairly allocated to different parts of the country. With regard to the items of brushes, brooms, glass, china, etc., he asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could assure the Committee that in no case would prison-made goods be purchased for the public departments. He also asked whether, in the arrangements which were made, every possible encouragement was given to those industries which produced glass and china goods. Might he also ask for information as to the astounding figure of £80,000 to be spent on the private official residences of the First Lord of the Admiralty and of the First Sea Lord? Why was that large sum of money to be spent on buying two houses for two officials—especially when they had regard to the fact that not a shilling had to be spent on a site, because the site was adjoining the Admiralty building? On page 19, there was an item of £28,000 for a vaccine station at Hendon, about which he desired some information. Further down a sum of £3,000 was taken for the sanitary improvement of public offices. Could the right hon. Gentleman explain the main items of that expenditure—an expenditure which he was sure the Committee would not grudge if the public offices were brought to the highest state of efficiency? Then a sum of £1,590 was to be spent on the Orange Street water works to supply water for the Royal palaces. What was the reason for that very large expenditure? Did the next item of £1,150 also apply to the water works, or did it apply to other heads of expenditure? In conclusion he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having increased by nearly £4,000 the sum for the maintenance and protection of ancient monuments in Great Britain.

Mr. C. E. PRICE congratulated the First Commissioner of Works on what was being done in connection with the Law Courts in Edinburgh. That was a subject which had been under the consideration of the Government for many years, and it might be interesting to the right hon. Gentleman to know that so far back as 1885 his father visited the Law Courts in Edinburgh, and, having considered their position, was satisfied that it was necessary to make some alterations, and, he understood, agreed to see those alterations carried out. Unfortunately a change of Government came about, with the result that the intention was not fulfilled. Five or six years ago a committee was appointed by the late Government to report on the matter, and then it was recommended that considerable alterations should be made. Four new Law Courts were recommended, and he was sorry that the recommendation had not been carried out. At the same time they were very grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for the trouble he had taken in the matter. Though the larger scheme was not to be carried out, yet the two Law Courts proposed to be built for the better accommodation of the public would be a very great boon indeed. Another item to which he would like to call the right hon. Gentleman's attention was rent and insurance, etc., in Scotland. In Edinburgh there was a large number of public offices scattered all over the city. These were rented from different persons for Government offices. Each of these places had its attendants, and public business was carried on at present with very great inconvenience. To bring these offices under one roof would effect economies in many ways, and would constitute a reform which he was sure would be greatly appreciated. He had specially risen, however, to thank the right hon. Gentleman for the great trouble he had taken in visiting Edinburgh last summer. While others were away enjoying themselves on their holidays, the right hon. Gentleman was visiting the Law Courts and informing himself about a question which had been so long under consideration.

*Mr. MORTON said he quite agreed with his hon. friend about the Law Courts in Edinburgh. He was afraid, however, that the right hon. Gentleman had not provided enough money for them, but he hoped that the amount would be made up in next year's Estimates. He, too, would like to know something about the £80,000 to be spent on official residences for the First Lord of the Admiralty and the First Sea Lord. It seemed to him to be extravagant to spend so much money on official residences. Not only were they pledged to economy, but they must carry out that policy in a practical manner. In reference to the protection of ancient monuments, the right hon. Gentleman told them a little while ago that the works at Stirling in the King's Park and the King's Knot were included in this Vote. He would like to know what had been finally settled with regard to that matter, and whether it would now be under the right hon. Gentleman's charge and be maintained and kept up for the public use for all time. He did not wish to prevent the Committee from getting on with its work, but he would point out that while they spent money in the extravagant way suggested by this Vote, they could not find money for things that which were wanted, and, in all this expenditure there was not one solitary shilling provided for Sutherlandshire.

Sir F. BANBURY said he joined with the hon. Gentleman opposite in protesting against the expenditure of £80,000 on two official residences, in which sum the price of the land was not included. They could almost build a palace for the amount asked for. For £40,000 they could build a house with thirty or forty bedrooms—quite a palatial dwelling. It was quite unnecessary. He did not agree with the hon. Gentleman that this money might be saved and spent in other directions; he thought the money could be saved altogether. It seemed to him that two houses could be built for £15,000 or £20,000—houses as good as any ordinary person would want to live in. It would be ludicrous to spend £80,000, in addition to the value of the land. A sum of £91,495 was put down for the maintenance and repair of public offices, an increase of £8,000 on the Vote for last year. He would like to know why that increase was so large. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the expenditure of £80,000 on two official residences, as up to the present only £13,000 had been spent upon them.

*Mr. HARCOURT said the hon. Baronet did not seem to be aware that the plan for these houses, which he thought so costly, was the plan of the late Government.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Did the First Commissioner vote against that plan?

*MR. HARCOURT: Certainly not, but this plan was in operation when he took office. These were the buildings which were to end the Mall and formed the plan which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. Augustine's had pressed so much on his attention as one which would finish off in a fitting way the Memorial to the late Queen Victoria. That the buildings were going to be occupied by two officials was of no importance, because those officials already occupied houses. The house of the Senior Naval Lord in Queen Anne's gate would be disposed of, and the First Lord would be transferred and his present house would be available for the extension of public offices. These two residences were being put into an ornamental building which was part of the plan for the Queen Victoria Memorial. The reason for the increase in the expense of maintaining public buildings was that they were taking over new buildings and had to pay for the dilapidations in houses given up owing to the transfer of the War Office. One item was £1,500 for securing the safety of the Rubens' ceiling in the Whitehall Banqueting-hall. There were also a number of chimney stacks on public buildings in Whitehall in a dangerous state, and he had had to ask for £1,000 in respect of them. There was also an additional £1,200 for the maintenance of the new War Office. The hon. Member for Hoxton was of a very inquiring turn of mind. He wanted to know a number of things, some of which were obvious, and some of which, as Lord Dundreary said, no fellow could understand. The hon. Gentleman asked why the cost of insurance was included in rents. One reason was that they had had to take over some buildings on short leases in which there was a covenant to insure, and they had to insure in order not to violate that covenant.

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked what was the amount of money spent on insurance. Was it large or small?

*MR. HARCOURT said he could not say, but he should think it would be a small sum. As to the purchase of furniture, so long as he was in his present office he would certainly not allot the making of furniture to any particular district. He must go where he could get what was best at the least cost.

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked if the right hon. Gentleman could state the amount spent upon furniture in London.

*MR. HARCOURT said he could not. Goods made in English prisons, such as baskets and mats, were used in Government offices, and he thought that a very proper source of supply.

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked if any goods made in foreign prisons were bought.

*MR. HARCOURT: Certainly not to his knowledge. He believed that no goods made in foreign prisons were bought for Government offices. The Orange Street Waterworks were necessary for the supply of public offices as well as palaces, and London was indebted to them for the fountains in Trafalgar Square. Certain sanitary improvements had been found to be urgently necessary, and he had carried them out a little in advance of the authority of Parliament.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) moved the reduction of the vote by £100 as a protest against the item of £80,000 for official residences. The right hon. Gentleman's answer that the plan was made by the late Government was no excuse for the extravagance of the scheme. He ventured to think that the bulk of the right hon. Gentleman's supporters would agree that for the House of Commons to vote £80,000 for two residences for officials of any sort was a monstrous thing. It was quite clear that there was yet time for repentance. He was aware that the expenditure was part of a plan for some ornamental buildings, but surely the place could be used for more ornamental purposes than for two people to live in. On page 46 of the Estimates there was an item of £1,000 for a passenger lift at the Admiralty

Office and £1,450 for another passenger lift at the Foreign Office. He had had a good deal to do with passenger lifts, and he knew they could be obtained for less than half that money. Why should the taxpayers be called upon to pay such extravagant sums? This was an example of the way in which public money was being frittered away by the present Government. The sum of £10,580 was put down for the Meteorological Office at South Kensington. He noticed that that amount was required "on account," and therefore he thought they were entitled to some explanation as to what the total amount to be spent was likely to be. There was an item of £1,800 to replace two defective boilers in the Royal Law Courts. Everyone who knew about the value of boilers for heating knew that that was an exceedingly extravagant amount. A passenger lift was to be provided at the Royal Law Courts at a cost of £1,000. That also was an extravagant amount, and the Committee ought to take exception to it. He thought the work should be done for £500. It was proposed to pay £9,300 in the shape of an annuity to the Land Registry. He supposed he should be out of order if he pointed out how exceedingly useless an institution the Land Registry was. But the £9,300 was to be paid "on account." He thought the Committee were entitled to an explanation of that. An item of £8,000 additional was described as including works of a minor character not exceeding £20. There must be a great many of those minor works to make up an increase of £8,000.

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £312,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. William Rutherford.*)

*MR. HARCOURT said he had already, when replying to the hon. Member for the City of London, dealt with a number of the matters to which the hon. Member for the West Derby Division of Liverpool had referred. The building which was to be utilised for the housing of the two Admiralty officers formed part, not indeed of the Queen Victoria Memorial, but of the Queen Victoria Memorial scheme. The actual purpose to which the interior of the building would be put was not very material. It was thought best, however, to put it to the use proposed, for which part of it was more suitable than for public offices. In reply to the hon. Member's Question as to the amount to be spent on the Meteorological Office, he had to say that the amount was £10,580. As to the cost of the lift at the Royal Law Courts he might say that he had had some experience in the putting up of passenger lifts in private houses, and he knew that they were not so expensive as in public buildings. The hon. Member had said the work should be done for half the price proposed. If the hon. Member could provide an effective lift, including all the structural work, as well as the machinery, for less than £1,000 he would give him the job.

*MR. CARLILE said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that the two palaces at the Admiralty formed part of the Queen Victoria Memorial. In other words the right hon. Gentleman practically debarred the Committee from discussing the Vote.

*MR. HARCOURT said he could not allow the hon. Gentleman to make that statement. What he said was that the building formed part of the memorial scheme, not that it was part of the memorial itself. The late Government added it to the Queen Victoria Memorial scheme. He had no wish to bar discussion. The hon. Member must not say it was for that purpose that he stated that it was part of the Queen Victoria Memorial scheme.

*MR. CARLILE said the right hon. Gentleman might take that view of it, but it was not the view taken by Members amongst whom he sat. There had been previous discussions on the provision of these two palaces, and now the Vote was thrown at them in a way that practically closed the discussion. He protested against that. He thought it would have been better if the two residences had appeared in the Estimates as a part of the Memorial scheme, in which case no criticism would have been offered. To spend £80,000 in merely providing palaces for two officials appeared, on the face of it, to be a piece of gross extravagance. One of the residences was for the First Sea Lord. Sailors were not difficult to satisfy in the matter of accommodation. The size of these palaces seemed to be suggested by the size of the British Navy. Had the two individuals immediately concerned been consulted? He could not think they desired that such palaces should be provided for them. In view of the large outlay which the palaces would involve, he doubted whether the First Lord of the Admiralty and the First Sea Lord would be able to afford to live in them after they were built. He hoped that the Amendment would be carried to a division as a protest against such wasteful extravagance.

*MR. ANNAN BRYCE said that, in his opinion, there was some force in the objection raised on the other side to devoting these expensive buildings to the residences of officials. The officials had not salaries adequate to keep up such houses, and he agreed that it would be better to use them as public offices. He hoped the new buildings would not be so offensive to public taste as the Government offices recently completed in Whitehall. Anything more monotonous, tedious, and unworthy of the nation it would be difficult to imagine. He did not think that anyone would agree with the right hon. Gentleman that that building was of an ornamental character. It was like a building that a boy might make out of a box of bricks.

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) said that he desired some information in regard to an item of £40,000 for furniture for public offices. Some years ago, when a similar item was under discussion, it was ascertained that the supply of furniture for public offices had been practically in the hands of two or three firms in London, and a promise was then made that the practice should be discontinued, and that in the future the furniture should be tendered for, and that tenders should be open to firms, not only in London, but also in the provinces. He wished to know whether tenders had been invited for this £40,000 worth of furniture, and what publicity was given to the invitation for such tenders? He did not suggest that the right hon. Gentleman would be guilty of any trick of the kind—far from it: but it was quite possible to advertise for tenders in a newspaper which was not seen by anyone connected with the furniture trade. There was another point to which he wished to call the right hon. Gentleman's attention. Many Members to whom he had spoken on the subject agreed with him that it would be a great convenience if another lift were constructed in that building.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not on the House of Commons Vote now. The Vote is for the public offices.

*MR. HARCOURT said he would consider the suggestion which the hon. Member for Shoreditch had made. Anyone could be put on the list of contractors for furniture, so long as he could satisfy the Office of Works that he was competent to carry out the contract, and paid his men fair wages. He could not tell the hon. Gentleman at the moment in what newspapers the tenders were advertised for.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked when the Mall would be opened into Charing Cross?

*MR. HARCOURT said that it could not be opened until the new building was finished.

MR. DALZIEL: In one year or two?

*MR. HARCOURT: I am afraid it will be more than a year.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 27; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 101.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry,N.)
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hay, Hon Claude George
Hervey,F.WF.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Kimber, Sir Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton
Thornton, Percy M.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Watson Rutherford and Mr. Carlile.

NOES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Jn.Emmott (Somerset
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,SGeo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'd
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,RtHnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clarke, E. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol,S.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
M'Crae, George
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan.J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson,CharlesN(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembr'ke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E.(Waterford
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards.Thomas(WMonm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robertson,SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scott, AH(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie

Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

6. £47,400 to complete the sum for Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked if the right hon. Gentleman could give them any information as to how long it would be necessary to exclude the public from the British Museum Reading Room? It was a very serious step to take in view of the fact that large numbers of people earned their livelihood at the Museum.

*MR. HARCOURT said it was estimated that the cleaning of the Reading Room would take six months, but arrangements were being made by which students would have the use of a large room capable of accommodating some 200 readers. He realised the great inconvenience it was to have the room closed, but after fifty-seven years it was necessary to do some cleaning. No pains would be spared to have the work completed as rapidly as possible.

MR. DALZIEL said he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for his reply, and would only appeal to him to make the choice of those who were allowed to use the large room as liberal as possible because, in many cases brought to his notice, it was a question of earning a living. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give attention to the matter, so that no one would suffer through the cleaning, which might entail great loss upon a large number of people.

*MR. HARCOURT said he would do what he could personally, but the hon. Member no doubt realised that he had no official control over the building.

MR. DALZIEL said perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would make representations.

Vote agreed to.

7. £46,600 to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain.

8. £91,000 to complete the sum for Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens.

*MR. MORTON asked for information as to Linlithgow Peel or Palace. The walls were in a good state of repair, and he had never been able to see why a roof should not be put on the building. If the money could not be found in any other way it might be raised by public subscription in Scotland. If a roof were put on, the Palace, with the grounds attached, would be a very fine place. A few years ago Lord Rosebery suggested getting up a public subscription for the purpose of improving the Palace, but did not successfully carry out the movement, so that the building still remained in the same state. He was aware that the Architects' Association in Scotland were all in favour of the building not being maintained as a ruin, but that a roof should be put on to it, as it was in quite a good condition for the purpose. His right hon. friend took a very intelligent interest in these old buildings, and he had no doubt that he had visited the Palace and made up his mind what ought to be done. He (Mr. Morton) was sometimes accused in these matters of being wanting in economy in dealing with public money, but he personally took a great interest in old castles and palaces, and he thought they should be maintained as being of historical interest. He had always contended that the Palace should be made fit for residential purposes, but he had never yet found a First Commissioner of Works with sufficient intelligence, such as he hoped the present occupant of the office enjoyed, to understand that it was essential that a roof should be placed on this building.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) called attention to the fact that a footpath between Holyrood park and King's park, Edinburgh, which in the interest of public safety ought to be lighted, was unlighted. He understood that communications had taken place between the corporation of Edinburgh and His Majesty's Board of Works, and they had agreed that it was in the public interest that that path should be lighted. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to put money on the Estimates to carry out the scheme this year, but he would press him to do so if possible.

*MR. HARCOURT was afraid his hon. friend the Member for Sutherlandshire would be as much dissatisfied with his intelligence as he had been with that of his predecessors. He had, it was true, taken a great interest in Linlithgow, and he had made inquiries as to what were the possibilities. He did not as a result think they could put a roof on the old walls, as it would involve the erection of skeleton steel frames to carry the roof apart from the walls. That would be a very costly operation, and he preferred Linlithgow as it was, in other words as a venerable and valuable ruin, than to have it with a new roof. As to the lighting of the footpath referred to, the matter had been laid before him and he would take care that it was dealt with before next year.

Vote agreed to.

9. £32,400 to complete the sum for Houses of Parliament Buildings.

MR. MORTON asked for information with regard to the item of £4,150 for furniture on page 21. He wished to know how much of that amount was for furniture for the House of Commons, and how much for the House of Lords. He desired to have the information because he believed that the House of Lords was a very expensive institution, and that it was costing the country a good deal more than it was worth.

*MR. HARCOURT said he was afraid he could not give the information asked for, because in this matter they treated the Houses of Parliament as a whole. In all probability, however, a very small proportion of the amount would be required for the House of Lords, because that august body sat so seldom and for such short hours that it was practically impossible for them to wear out their carpets and furniture in the same way as the House of Commons.

MR. J. WARD urged the necessity of separating the accounts of the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The House of Lords was an institution antiquated and useless—at least a good proportion of the people thought it useless—and Members of the House of Commons should be given an opportunity of saying whether the time had not arrived when they who voted the supplies should cease to do so for an institution which performed no useful function whatever in the Constitution. The accounts of the two Houses should therefore be separated in order that the House of Commons might see whether they were getting value for money. Under no circumstances could the House of Lords be described as a representative body. The two institutions were absolutely hostile in character, and that was another reason why the accounts should be separated.

*MR. HARCOURT said that it was impossible to separate the accounts of the two institutions which, although extremely different in character, occupied a common building, and therefore all requirements such as electric current, water, fuel and gas, etc., were taken in common. He could not, for instance, without having very elaborate meters to measure the gas consumed in this House and that emitted in the other possibly separate such an item as that. He sympathised with the ultimate object of the hon. Member, and when the hon. Member went tiger hunting across the lobby, he hoped to accompany him either as loader or beater. It would not, however, be the act of a prudent shikari to go into the cover and disturb the game in advance with a pop gun. By separating these items they would only make members of the other House uncomfortable, whereas what they wished to do was to make that institution not uncomfortable, but innocuous.

Vote agreed to.

10. £2,100 Salisbury Memorial.

*MR. HARCOURT in moving to report progress, said that he reserved the Vote for his own salary in deference to the desire that had been expressed.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. J. A. Pease.*)

MR. MORTON said he objected to adjourning at that hour; they had a long evening before them. There were several Bills on the Paper, and surely under those circumstances the House might be allowed to continue its labours. He appealed to the hon. Member to allow the House to continue, because if it did nothing else it would perhaps enable him to advance his Railway Tickets Bill which he had been waiting to bring before the House for fifteen years.

MR. J. A. PEASE said the reason why it was impossible to meet the views of the hon. Member for Sutherlandshire was that this was one of the allotted days devoted to Supply; if any other business were taken it would not rank as an allotted day and would therefore be lost. It was for that reason and no other that he moved the adjournment of the House.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at a quarter after Eight o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 9th April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the borough of Belfast (North Division), in the room of the right hon. Sir Daniel Dixon, Baronet, deceased.—(*Sir A. Acland Hood.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.

Ordered, "That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow."

Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway Abandonment Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Adlington; Avenue (No. 9) Pit; Bathwell Park; Boney Hay; Braidhurst; Brereton; Brereton (No. 2) Pit; Brownhills; Burntwood; Cannock Chase; Collin's Green; Douglas Water; Ford's; Forth and Wilsontown; Govan; Greenfield; Langtree; Oakengates; and, Thankerton Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

COLTON, WILLIAM GEORGE.

Petition of William George Colton, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Brechin, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Arbroath; Carluke; Cathcart; Darvel; Edinburgh (three); Falkirk; Kinross; Kirkwall; Kirkwall and St. Olva; Montrose; Newton; Pentland; Portmahomack; Saint Margaret's Hope, Orkney; Saltcoats; Sandwick; and, Stornoway; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Altrincham, against; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PURSHAD, THAKUR.

Petition of Thakur Purshad, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

REMUNERATION OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS TO CROWN COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES.

Return [presented 8th April] to be printed. [No. 103.]

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of June, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of February, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Copy presented, of regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant prescribing the manner in which sporting rights, vested in the Land Commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 13 of the Act, are to be dealt with by the Land Commission [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of General Annual Report on the British Army for the year ending 30th September, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (GENERAL REPORTS).

Copy presented, of General Report by the Chief Inspector of the Southern Division of Scotland for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES (SCOTLAND) (BY-LAWS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th November, 1906; *Mr. Marnham*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 104].

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1907, dated 22nd March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Foreign and Colonial) Amendment (No. 3) Regulations, 1907, dated 20th March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MUNICIPAL TRADING (GERMAN EMPIRE).

Address for "Return showing, so far as the particulars can be obtained, for the following towns of the German Empire, viz.: Berlin, Bremen, Frankfort-on-Main, Cologne, Dusseldorf, Elberfeld, Strassburg, Stuttgart, Munich, Nuremburg, Leipzig, Dresden, Chemnitz, Breslau, Danzig, Konigsberg, Mannheim, Madgeburg, Stettin, Hanover, Hamburg, Essen, Brunswick, Barmen, and Dortmund, (1) the salaries of the burgomasters and professional members of the administrative boards; and (2) the nature and extent and, for each of the last four years for which figures are available, the financial results of reproductive municipal undertakings, including, for each undertaking separately, a short description thereof, date, and terms of original acquisition, or establishment, or subsequent extension, how managed, capital employed, and how obtained, value of the undertaking, capital paid off and outstanding, loan charges, provision for depreciation, gross income and expenditure, net profit or loss, how profit is allocated or loss met, amount of relief or burden to taxation, number and salaries of the chief paid officials, number of workpeople, rate of wages paid in chief classes of labour, and prices charged for products or services supplied or rendered."—(*Mr. Chiozza Money.*)

FLEETS (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES.)

Return ordered, "showing the Fleets of Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, United States of America, and Japan, on the 31st day of March, 1907, distinguishing:—Battleships, built and building; cruisers, built and building; coast defence vessels, built and building; torpedo vessels; torpedo boat destroyers, torpedo boats, and submarines built and building."

Return to show date of launch, displacement, horse-power and armaments reduced to one common scale (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 129, of Session 1906.)—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Population of Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the population of Ireland at the different decennial periods from 1841 to 1901 respectively; and what is the estimated population in 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*)—

Census of 1841	-	Population	8,175,124
,, 1851	-	,,	6,552,385
,, 1861	-	,,	5,798,967
,, 1871	-	,,	5,412,377
,, 1881	-	,,	5,174,836
,, 1891	-	,,	4,704,750
,, 1901	-	,,	4,458,775

The estimated population of Ireland on 30th June, 1906, was 4,387,887.

Use of Cotton-stalk Fibre for Paper Making.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any information is in possession of the Colonial Office regarding the use of cotton-stalk fibre for paper making; and, if so, whether he will cause such information to be forwarded to British Central Africa for publication in the *Gazette* of the Protectorate.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) There is apparently no information on the subject of my hon. friend's Question in the possession of the Colonial Office; but inquiry is being made with the view of transmitting to the British Central Africa Protectorate any information which may seem likely to be of value.

Cost of Construction of Uganda Railway.

MR. REES: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the figure £5,502,592, given by him as the total cost of the construction of the Uganda Railway, includes interest on the capital expended; and, if not, whether a sum of £160,000 more or less per annum during and since construction should be added, in order to arrive at the cost per mile to the taxpayer.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The sum of £5,502,592 does not include interest on the capital expended. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question I would refer him to the Answer given to the hon. Member for Preston on 28th February, in which the following statement was made:—"Nothing is chargeable to the line for interest and there is no debt accumulated for unpaid interest. The funds for construction were borrowed from the Consolidated Fund, and are being repaid by annuities charged on the Vote for Colonial Services." A statement of these annuities is given on page 2 of the Parliamentary Paper, "Uganda Railway Acts, 1896 and 1902, Account for the period ended 31st March, 1906," and the total amount which will be repaid by means of them is £7,909,294 12s. 6d. Deducting from this the amount mentioned above, the total amount which will be paid for interest is £2,406,702 12s. 6d.

Repayment to Civil Contingencies Fund.

MR. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when will the Estimate in respect of repayment to the Civil Contingencies Fund be presented.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Probably in July.

Welsh Education Department Staff.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Board of Education if the existing officers and clerks of the Board of Education now assigned to the Welsh Department will continue to have access to, and be subject to supervision by, the permanent secretary to the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) There is nothing to add to the Answer given to this Question when put on 13th March by the hon. Member for Aston Manor,† except that as regards the examiners in the Welsh Department the Answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Metropolitan Police—One Day's Rest in Seven.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state how many inspectors, sergeants, and constables it is calculated must be added to the Metropolitan Police Force to give each man one day's rest in seven.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The required number of officers of each of these ranks would be twenty-seven inspectors, 138 sergeants, and 1,378 constables.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 40.

Metropolitan Police Library Fund.

DR. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what was the total amount subscribed by the Metropolitan Police to the Library Fund for the year ending 31st December, 1905; how many new books were purchased during the year, and at what cost; how much was expended upon newspapers; whether any statement of this expenditure is published, and where; and whether, as a large majority of the subscribers do not live in the section houses, but are either householders or lodgers, and as such compelled to pay the local free library rate, he will consider the advisability of confining the library subscription to those men who reside in the section houses.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The detailed figures for the year 1905 are not available, but the total amount subscribed for the year ending 31st December, 1906, was £883. Of this sum, £254 was spent on books and £359 upon newspapers and periodicals. The statement of expenditure has not been published, but there is no reason why it should not be, and this can be arranged. Police libraries are open to resident and non-resident officers alike, and are used by both classes. If the subscription was confined to residents the amount raised would be insufficient to maintain the libraries. The system appears to meet with the general approval of the Force, and no complaints have been received with regard to it.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty with reference to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Engineer and Marine Officers which the Board are now considering, whether he will undertake that no changes of an extensive character will be made on the lines of that Report without opportunity being given for discussing them in this House.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): Until the Report has been fully and finally considered, it would be unusual and premature to make any statement as to any action on the part of the Admiralty.

Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, having regard to the fact that in the year from the 1st July, 1905, to 30th June, 1906, which is the latest period for which figures are available, 1,840 Chinese coolies were repatriated as permanently incapacitated for work owing to physical infirmity or disease, he will inquire into the mortality among these coolies on their return voyage to China; and will he consider whether the number of such coolies put on board ship in a moribund condition should not be included in the statistics of mortality among Chinese coolies employed in the Transvaal.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I have no information beyond that contained on pages 28 and 29 of Cd. 3338.

SIR H. COTTON: Will the Secretary of State be good enough to obtain the information?

MR. CHURCHILL: I shall be glad to get as much information as possible for the House of Commons, but this is not a matter for which the Colonial Office is now responsible.

SIR H. COTTON: But the information asked for relates to a period when this Government was responsible.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am sure the Colonial Government will be willing to give what information it can, and I will see if this is information which we can properly ask for.

Mr. Stead and the Hague Conference.

MR. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will lay upon the Table the instructions given to Mr. W. T. Stead prior to his mission to European Courts in connection with the forthcoming Hague Conference.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): There had been no such mission which had any connection with His Majesty's Government.

House of Commons Police.

MR. HADDOCK: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department from what Vote the increased cost of police periodically engaged at the House of Commons during the last few months will be met.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The cost of the extra police from time to time engaged within the precincts of the House of Commons is charged to the House of Commons Vote. The cost of extra police employed in preserving order in the streets contiguous to the House is chargeable to the police fund, and therefore not on the Votes.

Royal Scottish Museum.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): On behalf of the hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire, I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he proposes to remove the buildings adjoining the south side of the Royal Scottish Museum, in order to provide for the safety of the museum against fire, in view of the fact that the iron shutters recently erected afford no more than a temporary method of dealing with this danger.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): I regret that I am unable to give the hon. Member any pledge as regards the removal of the buildings adjoining the south side of the Royal Scottish Museum. Within the last five years two houses have been purchased and demolished on this side, because they constituted an imminent risk from fire. But the immediate danger having been removed, I am not prepared at present to suggest any further charge upon public funds.

LORD BALCARRES: On behalf of the hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire, I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, if the defects in the existing system of heating and ventilating the Royal Scottish Museum will be entirely remedied during the forthcoming year.

MR. HARCOURT: The reply to this Question is in the affirmative.

Lune Fishery Board.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somersetshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that the Lune, Wyre, Keer, and Cocker Fishery Board refused, on 16th March, 1907, an application from the Ingleton Angling Association for a general licence, although the latter offered to pay £5, to provide a watcher, and to spile and stock the streams; and whether, in view of the provisions of the Acts as to the obligation of the Lune Fishery Board to grant a general licence to duly qualified persons offering to pay such sum as the Conservators may determine, with the sanction of the Board of Fisheries, he will say what steps he proposes to take in order to bring about a settlement of this dispute between the Conservators of the Lune Fishery Board and the executive of the Ingleton Angling Association.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): The Board of Agriculture are informed that the Lune Fishery Board refused the application of the Ingleton Angling Association on the ground that the consideration offered was insufficient. Negotiations on the subject are, however, still proceeding. The Board have no statutory authority to intervene in the matter, but will be very glad to do anything in their power to assist in the satisfactory settlement of the question at issue.

Irish Attorney-General's Clerk.

MR. HADDOCK: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state why, in Civil Service Estimates, Class 3, Vote 14, page 307, a new allowance to the Irish Attorney-General, for clerk £100, appears.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The allowance in question has been added to the Estimates because the Government are satisfied of the necessity for affording clerical assistance to the Attorney-General for Ireland. The amount is very much less than is voted for similar services to the English and Scottish Law officers.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Richard Durning Holt, esquire, for the County of Northumberland (Hexham Division).

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY BILL.

Order for Second Reading To-morrow read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NEW BILL.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES (No. 2) BILL.

"To establish a single Franchise at all elections, and thereby to abolish university representation and to remove the Disabilities of Women," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 147.]

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) rose to move, "That this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for home defence, or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field." He said: As I came into the House I took from the Vote Office a copy of the Secretary for War's latest Memorandum, showing how various enactments are affected by his Bill. I have not had an opportunity of studying this latest handbook to the scheme of the Secretary for War, but, thanks largely to the courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman, I have read carefully the Memorandum laid yesterday, which is distinctly a handbook to the Bill. In that the right hon. Gentleman pleads once more for a general approval of the whole of his scheme. I wish we could give it, but we cannot. This Memorandum does not dissipate the doubts which we entertained after listening to his first description of the scheme. I might almost say that in some particulars it confirms those doubts, but it is an extremely lucid document, and makes it easy for me to state shortly the case which, as we conceive, lies against the whole scheme. In the third paragraph the Secretary for War states that "establishments may be raised or lowered from time to time to suit the exigencies of the moment." That is a somewhat surprising statement, and certainly it is a statement which will not stand if the right hon. Gentleman is contemplating, as he very properly is, the provision for a considerable oversea expedition of a definite size to be maintained during a specified period. For if part of the scheme consists in making provision for such a force, then, if you lower your establishments later to suit the exigencies of the moment, the practical part of the scheme has to encroach still further on the speculative part. Then you must also provide for taking from the Territorial Force so much as is needed for your expedition, and so much more as may be needed for the expedition when you have reduced their establishment. You must see to it, also, that what you wish to take shall be worth taking. In this Memorandum the right hon. Gentleman goes on to appeal for continuity in military affairs, and asks that the country, in order that such continuity may be maintained, shall approve the system on which the military administrators are at work, and uphold that system in spite of defects which may be pointed out by critics. I agree at once that flaws can be found in any scheme, however homogeneous. But what if it should turn out that this scheme, partly because it departs from the continuity of past administration, is no system and is bound to break down? It cannot then be approved. This scheme embraces two plans—first, the practical plan for providing, despatching, and maintaining a large oversea expedition. We find many merits in that plan, and some grave defects. Secondly, there is the speculative plan for creating out of the existing

Auxiliary Forces a new Territorial Force. We think that plan visionary under the conditions of the proposal. Above all, we said that the two plans, the speculative and the practical, are not correlated in this scheme, and that there are no adequate or practicable provisions for making the Territorial Force do what it must do if it creates an expeditionary force of the size contemplated. The Secretary for War is perfectly cognisant of the necessity that his second line should support and expand his first line. That is the burden of his song. The right hon. Gentleman quotes in the Memorandum the classic passage in the Report of Lord Elgin's Commission—

> "No military system will be satisfactory which does not contain powers of expansion outside the limit of the Regular Forces of the Crown."

But there are no powers for expansion in this scheme. The right hon. Gentleman knows that the Commissioners did not mean what he means when they wrote those words; they contemplated two definite matters; they laid down that there must be an oversea obligation lying upon the second line, and, in the second place, that there must be compulsory training in time of peace in order that men should be fit to discharge their duties in time of war. Both of these recommendations are ignored in the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman, and it is almost like playing with words to quote that passage and to ignore those two recommendations. The Secretary for War has adopted neither for his Territorial Force, and he abolishes the Militia, to which the first obligation of oversea service might easily have applied, and to which the second obligation of compulsory training in time of peace might conceivably have been applied in the future if needed at any time. That being so, I claim that this system is no system; it is not systematic; it is incoherent in that it creates a great gap between the first and second line of the force it contemplates. With that I pass to the Bill itself. The right hon. Gentleman has objected to legislation by reference, and, although Clause 9 somewhat bristles with applications of the Army Act, in the main the Bill is not an instance of legislation by reference. But it is a remarkable instance of legislation by regulation. I have never seen a Bill which purported to do so much by regulation after obtaining the general assent and sanction of the House. I do not make any great complaint of that, provided that it is clearly understood that this is an enabling Bill of the widest possible description so far as the Army Council is concerned, and to that extent a disabling Bill so far as this House is concerned. If we once pass this Bill we shall part for ever, to an unusual extent, with our annual control over the forces of the Crown, and, to an unprecedented extent, with our financial control over the Auxiliary Forces. We shall authorise the Army Council to take any steps covered by the very wide provisions of this Bill which they may think necessary in order to carry out any feature of the right hon. Gentleman's plan—in short, we shall launch the whole scheme on its long voyage towards the horizon of hope. This is the only adequate opportunity we shall ever enjoy of criticising any feature of the whole plan the merits of which we doubt, or to the demerits of which we take exception. I make these observations because some critics, including eminent men for whom I have great respect—Lord Roberts, and that brilliant writer who has been a brilliant soldier, the military correspondent of *The Times*—advise us to approve out of hand the practical part of the scheme affecting the Regular Army for despatching an expeditionary force, and to consider, as a separate affair, the speculative part for converting the Auxiliaries into a Territorial Force. With a very real and very sincere respect for some of those critics, I entirely demur from that course, and strongly advise the House not to follow it. You cannot consider the speculative part of the scheme affecting the Auxiliary Forces as a separate matter. It is not too much to say that the size, shape, and constituent elements of the Territorial Force in its final form in this Bill have been absolutely dictated by the size, shape, and constituent parts of the expeditionary force which the right hon. Gentleman also contemplates. For, in attempting to organise that expeditionary force, the right hon. Gentleman has, in his own words, to take the substance of the Militia and to embody it in 66 new third battalions; those two operations, covered by Clauses 29 and 32 of the Bill, involve the transfer of at least 60,000 men—I think it is more—from an auxiliary to a regular basis, and in that transfer and embodiment the Militia disappears. The scheme abolishes a force which is not ideal, I readily admit, but which practically, and with a great measure of success, has subserved three necessary purposes. It has given a stream of recruits for the Line, it has given us battalions to take the place of Regular battalions at Colonial stations, and thus liberated those Regular battalions to take their place in the fighting line. During the Peninsular War, as the right hon. Gentleman states in his Memorandum issued yesterday, it gave 100,000 men as drafts for the fighting line, and during the South African War it gave 50,000 more. His plan abolishes that force, and creates a Territorial Force to subserve, amongst other things, two purposes. It will take the place of the Regular battalions at Colonial stations, and it will provide drafts for the Regular Army. But this force is made up of material which must always be exclusively drawn from the Volunteers, a body of men who have never been expected to perform these services, except in an infinitesimal degree, and who perform their main obligation by training for home defence. If that is a fair description of the two aspects of the right hon. Gentleman's plan, it is not too much to say that the scheme raises questions of wide political interest not less than of grave Imperial importance. In the first place, it challenges the assent of at least three considerable bodies of opinion in this country. It challenges the assent of those who are attached by many ties to the Auxiliary Forces as they now exist—men who have served in these forces, men who hope to serve in them, men who have made considerable sacrifices of the purse in order to make these forces efficient. It challenges the assent of another body of opinion, relatively smaller, but still large and perhaps growing—those who, rightly or wrongly, think that a measure of compulsion, ranging from universal compulsory service to some revision of the Militia Ballot Act, is necessary if our military system is to be made efficient and fair between man and man. The third body of opinion which the scheme challenges is far smaller, but still considerable—those who object to what they call militarism and who demand economies on a larger scale in the military service of the country than are contemplated in the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. Unluckily, these three bodies of opinion do not agree among themselves. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] Yes; but that they will have to be considered must be apparent to everyone, and particularly to the author of the scheme. Again, the Imperial gravity of the issues raised by the plan can hardly be exaggerated. It is not only the problem of home defence that must be considered. The Government must also consider the organisation of a considerable expeditionary force—a force much larger than was ever contemplated before the South African War—for despatch abroad to meet an Imperial need. In doing that it is essential to set up a model which our self-governing Colonies can imitate, and which we would wish them to imitate. In the opinion of the Opposition, the model of the Territorial Force that is included in this scheme is not one which can be followed by the self-governing Colonies. No one can pretend that the subject of military defence is popular. Indeed, we all recognise that the intricacy of the problem is inherent in the complexity of the Empire. Therefore the Opposition do not approach the consideration of the scheme in any Party spirit. Then why do we make themselves responsible for a reasoned Amendment which, if carried, must kill the Bill? We do so because the doubts which we originally entertained as to the soundness of the scheme have not been dispelled, and cannot be dispelled by further actuarial returns or by eloquent pleadings in favour of some great national ideal. These doubts can only be removed by the right hon. Gentleman retracing his steps and reconsidering his scheme at the point when he decided to abolish the Militia. We move the Amendment because we see some great defects in the scheme. In the second place we do not think the Territorial Force is adapted to the end of providing expansion and support for the fighting line, because we do not find that it is linked in any practical manner with the expeditionary force. In our view any Minister, in dealing with this very difficult problem, must follow one of two broad alternatives. He must either do what the Opposition would like to see done — develop the existing forces, perfect the Regulars, the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers, and adapt them, as far as possible, to that succession of mutual support which is the real and true aim of any sound military system; or if he despairs of that alternative, he must frankly abolish the present system, stock, lock, and barrel, and adopt a uniform system, which to be uniform and equitable must be compulsory. The objection which the Opposition urge to the scheme of the War Minister is that it is neither one thing nor the other. In the speculative part of his scheme, creating the Territorial Force, the right hon. Gentleman embodies the outward appearance, and to some extent the inward construction, of a compulsory system; but, having done that, he relies entirely upon voluntary effort. The Opposition do not believe such a plan will work. If the system is to be uniform, it must be compulsory. If it is to be voluntary, it must be varied to meet the different needs of all sorts and conditions of men. I pass from the speculative plan for creating the Territorial Force to the practical plan for creating the expeditionary force. In the scheme, one plan or the other had to predominate. The practical plan has triumphed, and the speculative plan has one to the wall. It is in order to make practical the part of his plan dealing with the expeditionary force, in order to ensure that such a force could be sent abroad and properly maintained when so sent, that the Secretary for War has taken the substance of the Militia under Clause 29. It is for this purpose he has to recruit for the Army Reserve under Clause 11, and for this purpose he invites men to take over-sea service under Clause 12. Under this plan the Secretary for War subjects the Territorial Force to precisely the treatment of which the Militia complained, and for complaining the Militia is to be abolished. What, then, is gained by the plan? The Regular Army will be larger by 60,000 men at the expense of the Militia, but the men are to be attracted by expedients which nobody can call satisfactory, and which nobody will adopt unless driven to the plan by sheer necessity for the organisation of an expeditionary force of this kind. The Regular Army will contain elements hitherto not thought worthy of being contained in it, and the Auxiliary Forces will be completely divided from the Regular line. In defence of his plan the Secretary for War quotes Lord Elgin's Commission, and this expeditionary force dominates the whole of the plan; it dooms the Militia and subjects the new Territorial Force to precisely the treatment which led him to find justification for abolishing the Militia. But I need not labour the point. All those who defend the right hon. Gentleman's scheme are military men or the mouthpieces of military men, and they dwell on the practical aspect of it; they find it good to have an expeditionary force so organised that they need not bother about anything else, and they regard the speculative part of the plan with a philosophic spirit that the right hon. Gentleman would admire were he not troubled with War Office difficulties. All his calculations, he said, were based on the complete mobilisation of the first line. The first thing to consider is readiness for mobilisation, and no army is worth anything if not ready to take the field. This, it is to be observed, applies only to the expeditionary force, not to the speculative plan for a Territorial Force. It is true he has said something else which seems to be in conflict with that view. He said, also, that so long as we had to maintain a large force in India and at Colonial stations we should require a Regular force of almost similar size at home. ["No, no."] At any rate, that appears to be so according to the scheme, but I cannot now cover the whole of it. The right hon. Gentleman said we were justified, having the material at home, in putting it into the most useful form possible; but is it necessary to abolish the Militia and to subject the new force to conditions under which the Militia so long suffered? If the right hon. Gentleman fulfils the expectations he has raised, and if he ever reduces the numbers for the Regular Army, there will be no necessity for his elaborate calculations. The scheme is not the ripe fruit of long consideration with friendly conferences with the Yeomanry and Militia; it is notoriously the more precipitate result of a hitch and failure to arrive at a satisfactory agreement between the Army Council and the Militia colonels. In his Memorandum of April 8 the Secretary for War told us that the bond of union between the Militia and the Regular Forces is severed, because, in 1901, the Militia Reserve was abolished. But a great many things have happened since 1901, in spite of which the right hon. Gentleman did not despair of preserving the Militia. There is a reduction of the Regular Army, and other steps are taken which tend to diminish the Reserve. The three-years' men are done away with, the establishments of the home battalions are reduced, and yet we are told the Regular Reserve will number 115,000, and I see in the Memorandum the actuarial department put the number at 121,000. But I do not believe that 115,000 will be provided, and I am sure 121,000 will not be. These actuarial calculations are a sort of widow's cruse, to which the right hon. Gentleman resorts when pressed by criticism. It is the exigency created by reducing the Regular Army and diminishing the Reserves which make the difficulties, already great, so much greater that the negotiations have broken down. These negotiations having broken down, this dubious device is resorted to for drafts as part of a practical plan. The Secretary of State says—

> "Either the Militia must be available for drafts, or . . . they must give up to the Line the men who have enlisted for six years."

The noble Lord the Under-Secretary, in another place, said—

> "The Secretary of State has been obliged to modify his view, because the representatives of the Militia would not modify their view on drafting."

It is the failure of these negotiations, conducted in circumstances created by the right hon. Gentleman, that has led him precipitately and mistakenly to decide on the abolition of the Militia. The exigencies of the situation demanded it, says the right hon. Gentleman, and for that purpose and no other he took the "substance" of the Militia. The change is unnecessary and unwise. It is unnecessary because there is every reason to believe that the Militia, and certainly the Yeomanry, dislike the scheme in its present state more than in its original shape. It is also unwise. We have been taught the necessity for maintaining an expedition such as is contemplated for more than six months; the South African War lasted for two and a half years. We have been taught the necessity for providing an increased force for Colonial garrisons. These things the Militia do, perhaps not in an ideal way; still they do it in a way there is no reason to believe the new force will do better. The change is, therefore, unwise. But if the Secretary of State for War really means that, when the South African garrisons are reduced, he can still further reduce the Regular Army—and many people think that—then the change will be insane. If the Regular Army is further reduced, there must be a greater number of special Reservists in order to have an expedition at all. The practical part of the scheme will break down with further reductions of the Regular Army. From that point of view the change is unwise; but it does not end here, for the special Reservists will not have adequate training. The men on whom reliance will have to be placed as the pivot of the scheme will have to be trained in existing depots, not convenient places, for they will not hold a battalion; the men will have to be trained 120 at a time. Nobody has ever tried such a method since David made an army by hiding men by fifties in a cave. They will have no more training than the Militia now have, and what musketry training will they get with the difficulties in the way of getting ranges? They cannot be properly trained under the conditions proposed. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that he has had some success in the matter of winter training; that may be so, but what success will he have when he takes the worst form of recruit obtained at the present time by the Militia, the least teachable man, and tries to teach him in so short a time all that he is required to know? As the depot is occupied, the recruits for the second battalions cannot be trained in the depot. There cannot be battalion training at the same time as recruit training. The right hon. Gentleman has pleaded for continuity in military administration. Might I remind him that not so long ago administrators for whose judgment he would entertain respect—men such as Lord Wolseley and Sir Evelyn Wood—insisted more than on any other aspect of the problem on the necessity for progressive training? They said they could not have battalion training at all if the battalion officers were to take over raw recruits from day to day, week to week, and month to month. There is one other defect in the practical part of the scheme—the deplorable expedient, as I consider it, which has been hastily adopted in order to ensure the number of recruits who now come out of the Militia into the Line. We are getting 12,000 recruits out of the Militia into the Line. Shall we get them out of the special contingent? The right hon. Gentleman thinks so. The military correspondent of *The Times* has said so. But I doubt it. They would all be taken from the Militia, because these, in the words of the Secretary of State, are the men who cannot get a job. It does not follow that they will all be got for the special Reserve. Many of the young men who join the Militia join it because they want, as they will say, "to see what it is like." They mean by that to see what serving in a battalion is like. They will not see what it is like if they go to a small depot to be grounded by a major and four captains whom they had never seen before and will never see again. How many will be tempted by the six months job under these conditions if it entails also an obligation to over-sea service at a moment's notice, serving under officers whom they have never seen, such service being a severe handicap in the competition with their fellow-citizens in civil life to get other jobs? In regard to the practical part of this plan, therefore, affecting the Regular Army, we have these three grave defects: our special Reservists in sixty-six third battalions will not be trained as well as everybody has said Regular soldiers ought to be trained; the training of the second battalions will be impeded; and the source of recruits on which we depend for the life of the Army will not be secured, but will be imperilled. Each one of these grave defects sprang solely out of the change made by the departure from the original plan and this hasty expedient adopted in its place. I almost hope I am forcing an open door. Why is it too late for the right hon. Gentleman to consider the propriety of retracing his steps? The Irish fragment of the original scheme is retained. Let the right hon. Gentleman make the rest of the plan conform to that fragment, and deal similarly with the Yeomanry. Without some such assurance and an explanation which will allay the apprehensions of danger lurking even in the practical plan of organising an expeditionary force, the Amendment must be pressed to a division. When I pass to the plan for creating a new Territorial Force I would ask and attempt to answer only two questions. What material will be left out of which this force is to be created, and will it really support and expand the fighting line? The Militia are gone, so I turn to the Yeomanry. What will be left of the Yeomanry? The Yeomanry is now in a satisfactory state, thanks to its recent more liberal treatment. If we make the reduction from 5s. 6d. to 1s. 5d.; if we abolish the system of catering which they understand and like, and put in its place the Army ration, we shall largely extinguish the present class of Yeomanry. They may take a greater obligation in peace on the present terms and be prepared to fight side by side with the Army on Army terms and Army rations in war. But they are not, if I understand them, inclined to train in times of peace at Army rates and on Army rations. Their standard of living and standard of self-esteem must be considered. The prosperous farmer's son and the bank clerk will not sacrifice a happy holiday to go out and wash, cook, and scavenge and eat the kind of food to be given them in this proposed training; although in war time they will rough it with anybody. The soldier is not asked to do all that will now be asked of this class, to learn to drill, to ride, and to do fatigues all at once inside a fortnight. The private soldier has his permanent cook-house, his dining and recreation rooms, his canteen and coffee bar, and the funds from various institutions husbanded by skilled advisers. The scheme as applied to the Yeomanry seems to be symmetrical, but it is almost absurd. This class will be lost; and it is to be borne in mind that it is the most teachable class, the only class that can be taught in the short time of training. To what class can we then appeal? To the class "that come to get a job;" but that class will go for six months, and not for fifteen days or eight days. On the hypothesis that they can be got they will be of no use, for they cannot learn anything in the time; and in attracting them the War Office will be competing against themselves and drawing them away from the special reserve on which the practical part of the plan depends. The same reasoning applies to the Volunteers. It cannot be thought that the Volunteer corps can all be satisfied with 1s. 3d. and Army ration, and all trained on a uniform and symmetrical plan. Supposing such difficulties as are thus suggested are surmounted in the only way in which they can be surmounted, by the provision of a great deal more money in regard to their camp allowance, it is idle to disguise that they will be less adaptable than the Militia and Yeomanry to the Regular *régime.* I may be wrong in this particular, but I do not think so. I believe you could impose conditions upon the Militia and Yeomanry, such as the imposition of oversea obligations, and by treating them as regular soldiers, which, though they may not like them at first, will eventually be accepted by them provided you do not abolish the Militia on the one hand and ask the Yeomanry to acomplish difficult tasks under impossible conditions on the other. But such obligations are less appropriate to the Volunteers. They are to be administered by county associations largely composed of civilians, while their constitution will be drawn up by the Army Council. The men under Clause 2 are to be trained and commanded always by Regular soldiers. There are to be fourteen divisional generals and forty-two brigadier-generals. I think Mr. Broderick must wish that he was in the House. The staffs of the three Army Corps which were to be formed under his scheme "pale their ineffectual fires" before the fourteen divisional generals and the forty-two brigadier-generals. And the Army Council is to retain the command of the first, and the Army Council is to decide how much money one association is to get, and how little money another association is to get. The powers of the associations are to be regulated by the Army Council. The men are to be enlisted out of the Territorial Force into the Army Reserve. The men are to be asked to accept an obligation for oversea service. Many a Secretary of State has made that proposal to his military advisers. In my day they would not hear of it. I do not know whether the Volunteers have changed their mind, but they described it as a plan for dividing the sheep from the goats. I remember bringing it forward myself in this House, and I remember that an hon. friend said that I made a very good speech, but that the less that was heard of it in the future the better. It lasted forty minutes by the clock on a June afternoon, and the next man on the Government Bench was put up to say that the Government had abandoned that idea. If you apply all these provisions to your Territorial Force, which I think I have shown will be almost exclusively composed of the Volunteers as we now know them, your Territorial Force will get smaller and smaller until it vanishes. But if you waive them all, then your Territorial Force will become quite valueless for the purpose you contemplate, namely for support and expansion in time of war. In any case they are under no obligation to undertake either the one duty or the other. I have tried to show that the scheme is not a whole, but that it is made up of two plans, one for a large expeditionary force which has many merits and some defects; and another of a speculative character to create a Territorial Force. I believe the second plan is a visionary plan, unless you are prepared to modify the conditions now to be found in this Bill. I say that the two plans are incompatible, since the first for an expeditionary force cannot succeed unless it depletes the Territorial Force, and that the Territorial Force cannot be kept at the numbers you desire unless you abandon the idea—and you ought not to abandon it—for an expeditionary force of 160,000 men maintained for six months. If you do not ask your Territorial Force to undertake these obligations for oversea service, then your plan for an expeditionary force breaks down altogether. Whatever happens to the one at the expense of the other, you have no plan under the Bill for adapting the Territorial Force to support the Regular Force. I may be told by the right hon. Gentleman that there are bridges in his scheme. I never quite understood what the right hon. Gentleman meant by that. When he talks sometimes of welding all our forces into one, and at another time, as a matter of the highest importance, of having two distinct lines, I do not quite understand him. But I say that if these bridges are to be a reality, and to be crossed in both directions by many persons, then I think the two lines—the two distinct forces—disappear. If generals are always to be crossing in one direction to command and to train, and if other generals, who are to sit as assessors at the board of the county associations, are to be always advising these associations that their men ought to enlist in the Army Reserve, and ought to undertake oversea obligations; if the Army Council lavishes money in counties where obligations are undertaken, and doles it cut penuriously in counties where the obligations are refused, then I say your idea of two lines is only a phrase, and the Territorial Force will be exposed to those very conditions which maimed the Militia to such an extent that the right hon. Gentleman felt justified in abolishing it. If you are to do that, it would be far better to keep the present system with the Militia and Yeomanry, who can be put under Regular officers, and who ought to be put under more stringent obligations, than to attempt to place these obligations on, and to put Regular officers so absolutely in command of, the Volunteers. Perhaps I shall be told that these bridges do not amount to much. Perhaps when the Volunteers realise all the conditions of this Bill we shall be told that the divisional generals and the brigadier-generals are only a temporary measure. We shall be told that Clause 11 inviting men to enlist in the Army Reserve is only intended for men on a non-regular basis, and to provide an ammunition column of men who know the handling of a rifle, but that it does not mean that the Regular Army is always to be bleeding the Territorial Force as the Regular Army has always bled the Militia. But, if we receive these assurances, then this talk about two distinct lines is not a phrase, it is a policy. I do not know which it is to be, but if it is a policy it is, in our opinion, a bad policy, and, above all, a bad policy for this country. We want in this country successive forces, one supporting the other. The universal experience of war preparation is that if it is to be effective it must be modelled on the image of war. It shows that what you need is such a continuous succession of waves to support the Regular Army, and it rejects altogether the dislocation resulting from two incongruous forces. We need such a succession of forces. That which is generally true is particularly true of our Empire, and we need such a succession of forces adapted to mutual support. You have now first the Navy, ready to fight at a moment's notice, then our Regular battalions abroad ready to fight without drawing on the Reserve, then the battalions at home ready to fight after drawing on the Reserve. And so we want the Militia and the Yeomanry placed under Regular officers, bound by oversea obligations to go oversea and fight when we are confronted by a great national emergency. Behind them we want the Volunteer Force ready to take their place when they have gone abroad under those conditions. This scheme provides nothing of the kind. It is incoherent, it is not in consonance with the genius of our people or the exigencies of our Empire, and it has this last and fatal defect. This scheme will prevent and delay the despatch of a regular expedition upon which so much care has been bestowed until after six months of war has elapsed. It may even, if unrest should prevail during that period of feverish preparation, inflict a graver injury on the State. It might tie down the Navy to the vicinity of these shores at a time when our national existence would depend upon our Navy being perfectly free to operate at any distance and in any direction. I beg to move.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that,' in order to insert, 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.' "—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The right hon. Gentleman opposite has held office in the War Office, and is, no doubt, an authority on military questions, to which he has devoted considerable attention, and as regards which in this House he has more than once shown conspicuous ability at a time when the House much needed encouragement. I trust he will understand that if my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War does not rise at once to reply to him as only some one who has had equal experience inside the War Office could, it is because my right hon. friend will have to reply on the debate. I therefore trust the right hon. Gentleman will understand that if some of the questions he has asked are left over it is in order that a fuller reply may be given later on. It is always a pleasure to listen to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He is a master of language and measured phrase beyond the reach of the ordinary man, and sometimes I have heard him use his gifts in such a way as to be exceedingly helpful to the House when in a difficulty. I cannot say I have found him so helpful this afternoon. The pleasure of listening to him was as great as ever, but the profit was not so great. Some of the right hon. Gentleman's points had, I think, but little substance. His first point was made on the statement in my right hon. friend's Memorandum that establishments may be raised or lowered from time to time to suit the exigencies of war. He took exception to that statement, but I think his objection was really not an objection of substance. That statement of my right hon. friend's meant that his scheme should have some elasticity, and if objection were taken to the statement as he intended it, it would be simply on the ground that it would be better to have a scheme which would have no elasticity. Then I think there is an answer to one or two other points. The right hon. Gentleman said that there are various sections of opinion to which the scheme of the Government has caused apprehension or dissatisfaction. He said that the section of opinion which is in favour of compulsion is not satisfied with it because it is not compulsory; while the section of opinion which depreciates too much military spirit is also not satisfied because there appeares to be too much military spirit in the scheme. The right hon. Gentleman said that unfortunately these various objectors do not agree one with another. He might have gone a little further and said, as I think fortunately for the Government, that these objectors answer one another. Someone must find grounds of dissatisfaction in any scheme of Army reform. The objection of the right hon. Gentleman that some sections of opinion are dissatisfied with this scheme really amounts to this—that it is impossible to produce any scheme of Army reform which will please everybody. That I fully admit. There is a difference of principle between us and the bench opposite on this question. It is shortly this. Right hon. gentlemen opposite consider that an effective scheme of Army reform ought to be one providing for organisation on at least three lines; we hold that if you organise on three lines you will increase expense and get, not efficiency, but confusion, and that a better plan is to organise on two lines. On that issue we are prepared to meet them. To organise on three lines is not practicable, but to organise on two lines will, in our opinion, give efficiency, economy, and strength. I will try to prove why we think so. My right hon. friend had three objects which he desired to secure in his scheme of Army reform. Any one who sets those three objects before himself, as he proceeds at the War Office to work them out, is inevitably led to the conclusion that his plan must be on two lines if those objects are to be secured. What had my right hon. friend in view? His first object was to organise the Regular Army at home and provide that it could be used abroad on the outbreak of war; in other words, that the country may be in a position to use, and use without delay in an emergency, the force for which it pays. I think as regards that point the fault which is found with the Government for having reduced the Regular Army is one of the letter only, and not one of substance. Numbers may be reduced, but power is increased. The question is not the numbers of your Regular Army, but whether you can use the numbers you have got. The scheme now before the House would enable us, on the outbreak of a serious war, to send abroad a larger force in less time and better equipped than before. It is true there is a saving of money, but it is natural there should be a saving of money. That is reached in this way. There are certain subsidiary services for which my right hon. friend will no longer provide by means of Regular Troops—the transport, supply, and medical services. He will provide for those from non-professional sources, the men provided for that purpose training with the Territorial Army. The right hon. Gentleman says that if we are going to induce those men to undertake oversea obligations, we shall deplete our Territorial Army, and diminish our power of expansion on the outbreak of war. No; because those particular men will be supernumerary. I maintain that my right hon. friend secures by his scheme efficiency and economy combined. We are always asking for economy. As regards the Army, we have for many years—I am not sure it is not true of both sides—believed there has been considerable waste, but when we do make a reduction of expenditure the question is at once raised on the other side: Are you not sacrificing efficiency? If there has been waste, however, it follows that it must be possible to have economy and reduced expenditure without impairing efficiency, and possibly with an increase of efficiency. The second object my right hon. friend had in view was that you should make provision which would enable you to maintain in the field for six months the force you have sent abroad. You must not only send it abroad, but you must have ready the organisation and material to maintain it in the face of the enemy for, at any rate, six months. This object my right hon. friend proposes to provide for by the special arrangement of the third battalions and the special contingent. It is a new arrangement, but we have been driven to have some arrangement for supplying drafts for the Army in the field, because we were left without any arrangement for supplying those drafts, and the Militia would not undertake to do it. It was absolutely necessary that there should be some arrangement. Here is where the root of the objection to the scheme before the House comes in. In providing drafts, in making your organisation to maintain the Regular forces in the field for six months, and to enable you to feed that force, you have necessarily by the logic of circumstances been brought into conflict with the Militia, which would not undertake the duty of providing the drafts. If, in a short sentence, the opposition to this Bill could be summed up, I think it might be summed up as a Militia opposition. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] Well, I listened to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and when I heard him dwelling on the question whether, after all, it would be necessary to divide upon the Amendment, it seemed to me that the question whether the Party opposite would divide on the Amendment would depend very much on the attitude of the Government towards the Militia. If it had not been for the attitude of opposition raised by the Militia question there would, I think, have been no Amendment from the Front Bench. As the hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield has not yet spoken, I think I am safe in saying that the strongest language up to the present used against the scheme has been that of the Duke of Bedford, who speaks on behalf of the Militia. He has spoken elsewhere in such terms of the special contingent and the special organisation for supplying drafts that I am not sure they could be repeated under the stricter rules which obtain in this House. They expressed the strongest possible dislike to the special contingent and these third battalions. I am not surprised that that dislike should have been expressed by any one in the Duke of Bedford's position, because the class which will be attracted into the special contingent is precisely the class of which, to a large extent, the Militia has hitherto been composed. Why should that excite disapproval in a Militia officer? It is because this is a limited class in our population. It consists of men who are very young, and who have not yet got into such employment that they cannot spare the time for a month or two's training. That is a limited proportion of our population, and, if you see in this Bill the destruction of the Militia, it is because, in the first instance, the special contingent and the third battalions will draw from that limited class a large amount of the elements upon which the Militia has hitherto depended. I understand, therefore, the Militia opposition to these special contingents; but the work of supplying the drafts to the Regular Army in the field must be secured somehow. If the Duke of Bedford and the Militia officers had assured us, or if right hon. Gentlemen opposite had been able to give us an assurance on their behalf, that they would supply the drafts for the Regular Army in time of war, then they would have had a case. If they had said they would do it better than the special contingent we should have admitted that that was a complete answer. But not only have they not said they would do it better; they have said definitely, emphatically, and finally, they will not do it at all. As regards supplying the drafts to the Regular Army, as regards the work of maintaining the Army in the field in time of war, the Militia has put itself out of Court, and my right hon. friend was bound to resort to some other method, if he was to be able to feed a force abroad. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has made considerable criticism, not from the Militia, but from the strictly military professional point of view, upon the training which will be given to the special contingent. My right hon. friend when he comes to deal with this question, will follow all those intricacies of detail, and explain precisely how we propose to carry out what we believe will be a satisfactory arrangement. These men will, at any rate, have as much training as the Militia have had. The right hon. Gentleman's contention is that they will not have a satisfactory training, and will be trained in such a way as to spoil the training which is given at the same time to regular battalions. We maintain the exact contrary. We believe they will get a training of a better quality than they would have had in the Militia, and we believe that that can be done without spoiling the training of the regular second battalions. I said the right hon. Gentleman opposite was a master of measured phrases. When he came to this point, however, I think his phrase was a little unmeasured.. He compared these special contingents to the men David took by fifties and hid in a cave. Was it David who hid them by fifties in a cave? In any case, if I remember rightly, the rations were very poor—these men were fed on bread and water. ["Locusts and wild honey."] Somebody said locusts and wild honey. My recollection of the men David trained is that they were exceedingly efficient, but even the right hon. Gentleman would not contend that there were already some regular troops in the cave who would be able to give an example and help to the special contingent. I repeat that the special contingent will, for the purposes of war, get a better training than the Militia have yet done, and that will be done without interfering with the training of the Regular troops. Those are the first two objects of my right hon. friend—to be able to send a force abroad and to be able to supply it with drafts for six months when it is in the field. Those are the first two paramount objects of Army reform, and you must make sure of those two objects before you proceed to anything else. You must secure a third object afterwards, but you must not secure that third object at the expense of either of those first two objects. The right hon. Gentleman complains that, when we come to our third object, which is that of providing for gradual expansion in time of war, and to secure which we organise on two lines, we shall produce dislocation and destroy the link which ought to exist between the Regular Army and the force behind it. His policy, as I understand it, is that you must organise on three lines, and that you must link these three lines one with another. Well, his Government had some years which they spent in attempting to organise on three lines. They found great difficulties. Have they really seen their way to overcome those difficulties? They have made more than one attempt. I could not help remembering, when the right hon. Gentleman opposite divided my right hon. friend's scheme into two parts, the practical and the speculative, that they had two plans which were not linked together. Was not there the plan of one War Secretary and then the plan of another? Was not one of those policies speculative and the other practical? We have not found out yet which of those was practical and which was speculative. The link between the Militia and the Regular Army was destroyed by right hon. Gentlemen opposite when they abolished the Militia Reserve. The right hon. Gentleman did not shirk that point. He admitted that they had destroyed the Militia Reserve, but, he said, a good deal has happened since then. There were the three years men. Were they to take the place of the Militia Reserve? But they were abolished by the Party opposite; and the three years men disappeared before the change of Government took place. The link had gone when the Militia Reserve was abolished, and what my right hon. friend has had to do has been to provide for gradual expansion in time of war, an organisation which, we believe, will be suitable to training and encouraging the military talent of the country. What sort of expansion do we want in time of war? We shall never attempt, and this country can never attempt, to overwhelm its foes by mass of men on land. Whatever big land war we engage in must, on our part, be a defensive war. It must be a war to defend, not a war to invade, in the sense in which Continental nations would invade each other. The object of each of the Continental nations engaged

Sir Edward Grey.

in a land war must be to overwhelm in mass of men, to reach the heart of the enemy's country and to overcome it by force. Our military problem will always be on land a defensive problem, and we have to bear in mind that, just as we cannot overwhelm in mass on land, so we cannot be overwhelmed ourselves. The Navy protects us against that. I do not want to go into the dinghy controversy, but what we have to provide against at home is, at most, a raid, and not to have to defend in mass. The assumption of the whole of our Army scheme is that the Navy keeps the sea communications open for us, and closes them to any one with whom we are at war. If the Navy cannot do that, the history of this country as a Great Power is at an end, and neither conscription nor any other system that can be devised will avail. Therefore, that is the assumption, and, if the Navy can fulfil that function, the country is protected absolutely. Distant places that can only be reached by sea communication are protected, but there do remain places of which India is most familiar to the House. There, with the frontier which we have, we shall not want men. We shall want, or we should want, if we are ever attacked, which, in my opinion, is an unlikely contingency—but, so long as it remains a contingency at all, it is something which must seriously be taken into account in our Army provision—not a great mass, but staying power and gradual expansion. And that expansion must be by units. How are you to produce, in the nation, that gradual expansion —it is gradual and not summary or sudden expansion that you want—in time of war? You must have an organisation in peace which can, in time of war, readily embody and train the Volunteers of the nation as a regular fighting force, and that is what my right hon. friend creates by this Territorial Force. The right hon. Gentleman says that all those who enrol themselves in the Territorial Force do not undertake any over-sea obligations. That is perfectly true. As regards any great war, we must, in this country, depend upon the patriotism of people who, in time of peace, have not undertaken any over-sea obligations. If you are to conduct successfully a great war, it can only be because such a war so appeals to the spirit and patriotism of the people of the country, because they so believe in the honesty and justice of their cause, that the question of whether a man has or has not undertaken an over-sea obligation is swept away by the wave of patriotism. Of course the Volunteers and Territorial Force will not undertake any over-sea obligations, and no nation has ever yet created a great army which has undertaken over-sea obligations. But the appeal which my right hon. friend wishes to make is to the nation as a whole, not to undertake over-sea obligations, but to enrol in a force which will enable them, voluntarily, if the time ever comes, to be trained at short notice to undertake any obligation which they are willing to undertake. If you are to do that, you must have something like a national organisation, and I believe you must have one organisation which will appeal to the nation as a whole. And that one organisation is the Territorial Army organisation proposed in the scheme now before the House—one organisation for all auxiliary and non-professional forces. What would happen if you attempted, under this scheme, two organisations instead of one for the Auxiliary Forces? For the Militia as it was you would not get the men, because they are being drawn away for the special contingent; and if, after providing a really efficient Militia organisation, you were then to proceed to provide a separate organisation for the Volunteers, you would incur great expense and get confusion and not efficiency as the result. The fact is that Lord Lansdowne really gave away the case as regards the Militia when he said the Militia had been plundered at one end for the Line and encroached on at the other end by the Volunteers. Yes, and if you follow that quotation out, you get, in my opinion, the corollary that if you are to maintain the Militia on its old basis, you can only do it by plundering the Line, or by encroaching on the Volunteers. The Militia, as it is, has no cavalry, no field artillery. Its strength has fallen, its officers are insufficient, the cost per head is increasing, the efficiency per unit is decreasing. If, as part of this scheme, you are to make it one of your objects to take the Militia up to its old basis, to provide cavalry and field artillery, and to get it to the strength at which you would wish to have it, you will find you have incurred very great expense, and if you are to proceed, after that, to organise behind that a third line, the Volunteers, you will soon find that your Army expenditure will run to an amount which I believe the country would not desire, and, as we believe, you would have created not efficiency but confusion. What has been the lesson of previous attempts at Army reform and of almost all Army questions for some years past? It has been that, inevitably, there has been confusion and waste. I believe that has been due, more than to any other one cause, to the attempt to organise on three lines instead of on two. What my right hon. friend proposes in his Bill is one Territorial Force which, as we believe, is adapted to attract every one in the nation who desires, voluntarily, to fit himself to defend the interests of his country, if need be. It is said that we shall not get the men. I think the right hon. Gentleman opposite said that the Volunteers were the worst off. Although we are not giving 2s. 6d., that 2s. 6d. went very largely to pay certain charges from which the Volunteers will now be entirely free. Therefore, the argument of the 2s. 6d. cannot really be used to prove discouragement of the Volunteers. But those who say we shall not get the men hardly realise what we are proposing to do. When they do realise that we are proposing to ask the Territorial Force to undertake a more extended obligation than the Volunteers have previously undertaken—that is to say, to go out for six months at home in time of war—they will see that we are providing the Volunteers with the stimulus of responsibility that they never had before. I think the late Secretary for War, if he was correctly reported, once said that when he went to the War Office he asked what the Army was for, and he did not get a satisfactory reply. If he has asked what the Volunteers were for, I am sure he has never had a satisfactory reply. The Volunteers have been regarded by some sections of opinion as a plaything to be indulged in.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Twenty years ago.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I said there have always been some people who regarded the Volunteers as a plaything to be indulged in. I did not say I did, or that anybody in particular did. Is there nobody who in the last twenty years has ever held that view? There will be nobody if this scheme passes, for then, for the first time, it will be made perfectly clear to every one that the Volunteers do not exist for their own sake, but for the sake of the country; that they have a definite, real responsibility and obligation, and a definite place in the defence of the country. That does, in my opinion, provide a stimulus and a spirit to which, I believe, the Volunteers will respond. I have always believed that if you only made to the voluntary public spirit of this country an appeal which was intelligent, reasoned, and clear, and gave them to understand that the appeal was made, not merely to sentiment, but because they were really wanted to undertake certain obligations, you would get a response. The fact that you will get that response I believe accounts for the apprehension that my right hon. friend's scheme may create too much of a military spirit in the country. I do not believe it will. It may increase the military spirit, but, if so, it will, I think, do it in the sense of creating public spirit. I would much rather in this connection use the phrase "public spirit" than "military spirit." We shall, I believe, under this scheme develop and encourage the talent of the able-bodied men of the country to defend it; we shall undoubtedly encourage the power of defence. Is there a risk that in doing so we shall also stimulate a tendency to aggression in the population? If there were such a risk, we should have to take it; but I do not believe there is such a risk. Nobody can dislike more than he who has for long had to do with public affairs what seems to be a rising tendency to aggression in the country in the public affairs of which he is engaged. But if the Volunteers realise that voluntary training is undertaken with a definite object, it will make men more serious. It is not seriousness but levity that creates a tendency to aggression. I do not believe there is a danger of increasing the military spirit in any sense other than that which would be more correctly described as public spirit. Everybody admits that reform is needed. You cannot have reform without change. The right hon. Gentleman opposite complained that in our plan we shall depart from continuity. We were obliged to depart from continuity, because the plans of our predecessors have not succeeded in solving the problem. As you cannot have reform without change, surely let us beware of saying that change is a necessary objection to reform. If you are to attempt reform without touching the Militia, and, indeed, spending more money on the Militia, and without making a new appeal to the Volunteers, then I think you may have reform with the minimum of change, but with an exceedingly undesirable change. You will have eliminated change with regard to the Militia and the Volunteers from your scheme of Army reform, but you will have introduced a new and most objectionable form of change, and that is an increase of expense. I think the system of change on which this scheme is based is to reduce expenditure and to simplify and to solve the problem. Of course, it will not meet the views of those who think that conscription is the only remedy, but I do not understand that to be put forward by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. If conscription is to be put forward in this House as an alternative to the scheme of the Government, then it must be put forward openly, and we shall be prepared to meet it. It is not, as I understand, put forward as an alternative in this Amendment. When the right hon. Gentleman talked of the need of modifying this scheme he hinted very obscurely at the possible ultimate rejection of this Bill, if not here, in another place. If the Opposition push this Amendment to the Second Reading to a division, it will mean that they have taken up a line of irreconcilable and determined opposition. The Opposition have less right than usual to object to this measure. They have had their chance; they have had it for some years; they have had their two plans, and I have not heard any indication that anybody wishes those plans to be revived if right hon. Gentlemen opposite succeeded in turning us out and had an opportunity of dealing with this problem again. Those plans having disappeared, the present Opposition having had their chance for some years, it was our duty to approach this problem; and I could not help thinking, when the right hon. Gentleman said our scheme was now launched on its voyage towards the horizon of hope, it would be much more correct to say that our scheme is the first in recent years in which hope has appeared above the horizon. The right hon. Gentlemen opposite could not solve this problem when they had a majority; they cannot now they are in a minority, because they cannot act, and they cannot carry measures through this House. Although they cannot perform, there is left to them under the Constitution a power which I do not believe any Opposition ought to have—the power to wreck. It would be unfair in me to infer from the tone of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman that they have resolved upon any such policy; but we never know whether this temptation to attempt elsewhere what they cannot do here may arise and prevail later on. If that were to be so, I should say never was there a more illegitimate use of what I consider to be the undue power which the Constitution now gives to the minority in the House of Commons. The scheme that my right hon. friend has brought before the House comes before it backed by military opinion. I am aware that a section of military opinion would prefer conscription, and it does not like this measure because it is not conscription. But that being out of court as an alternative for the purpose of this debate, we are entitled to say that it comes before the House adopted by military opinion, and with the military approval of those who wish to see the voluntary system made a success. We may claim for this scheme that it has been conceived in no party spirit. I think that has always been admitted, and any recrimination or any reflection upon its predecessors has been singularly absent from my right hon. friend's speeches, considering how much material he might have made use of. We do not wish to make it a party question. It has not been hastily produced; it is the result of a thorough review of the whole situation, and it is earnestly recommended to the House as the most coherent, the best-thought out, and the most acceptable and effective scheme of Army reform which has been presented to Parliament in recent years.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The military opinion which the right hon. Gentleman has given to the House in favour of this scheme is the same military opinion that was given to us by the predecessor of the present Secretary of State for War in terms equally strong; and in a book which the right hon. Gentleman published he has given chapter and verse for the approval of a diametrically opposite scheme by the three distinguished generals who have been referred to as approving of this new scheme. Therefore it is incumbent upon the House of Commons to consider this question for itself, and entirely apart from military opinion. One distinguished member of the Army Council has already expressed his opinion in favour of conscription. Therefore, I think the House of Commons must feel that it is our duty to settle this question for ourselves, and not be affected by the suggestion that certain distinguished generals have approved of this scheme, as they have approved of other diametrically opposite schemes. It is notorious that these distinguished generals are in favour of conscription, and time after time they have stated that none of these schemes will work, and that conscription is the only real solution of the problem. My right hon. friend has met the opposition in regard to the Militia, and I will not deal with that question. But I ask the House to consider the very grave doubts which some hon. Members entertain with regard to this scheme—doubts which do not diminish with careful consideration of the Memorandum laid before the House by the War Office. My sympathies are with my right hon. friend in his attempt to diminish the number of different services which exist side by side in this country, but I am amazed to hear the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs say that this is a scheme to diminish the cost. I am surprised to hear that statement from anyone who has carefully considered the question. There may be a temporary diminution of the cost by means which are very doubtful, but the statement that the scheme can be carried out within the limits of the figures presented to the House will easily be disproved before this debate ends. Admissions will be made by the Government; or, if they are not made, the scheme will be dropped, unless it is put in force in one or two counties experimentally. One of these two things must happen. Let us consider the results at which the Secretary of State is aiming, and the cost at which he expects to obtain those results. In this scheme all rests on the expeditionary force of 167,000 men. The numbers are an enormous increase on any that have hitherto been proposed; and the Foreign Secretary's speech was wholly lacking in any suggestion of why such a force should be needed at a moment's notice. No one suggests that an expeditionary force of 167,000 men is to go post haste to India at the beginning of a war. Both parties concur in the view laid down by the ex-Prime Minister, and the Secretary of State has expressly concurred in it, that the advance of Russia towards India, if it ever takes place at all, must be at a greatly diminished rate; it must take place by railways, and must be a matter of very slow progress. Therefore the expeditionary force cannot be intended for that purpose. Is it right that we should prepare our Army for operations of an immediate nature on this scale? I think the policy pursued by both Parties in the State up to the present time on this question of an expeditionary force is the wiser one. Our Imperial expenditure on land forces is already enormous—£20,000,000 in excess of the expenditure on our Fleet; while the reductions which have been effected on the Navy have been double those on the Army. In his Memorandum the Secretary of State for War said that his scheme is based on Cardwellian principles, and he went a little out of his way to propitiate my hon. and gallant friend beside me, and myself, by saying that Cardwellian principles were not necessarily concerned with linked battalions or particular terms of service. But Cardwellian principles are concerned with the cost of this scheme. To the seventy-four pairs of battalions now existing the right hon. Gentleman adds another seventy-four, so that in future there will be a treble fettering of the system round our necks; and then the right hon. Gentleman adds that this is the foundation of the particular size of his expeditionary force. I was astonished to hear that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover approved the size of this expeditionary force, for the Leader of the Opposition condemned it at the outset, on the ground that he could not conceive the circumstances for which it could be required, and that by implication it could only be intended for European complications. In that view I entirely concur. It is extraordinary how far the Secretary for War has gone in admitting that the gigantic size of this expeditionary force depends upon a mere accident. He has said—

> "The basis is that of the number of units actually in existence at home to find drafts for the force in India and abroad."

Then the right hon. Gentleman in February, in a debate in this House, asked himself the question, "Why fix on 160,000?" and his answer was, "Because I have all these men for another reason, to supply the drafts for India and abroad." Well, my right hon. friend has made a scheme for the despatch across the seas of an expeditionary force of 167,000 men, but it is necessary that we should press him more closely before we pass this Bill, for which we shall be responsible in the future, and in respect of which in the years to come we shall have to say what we meant by giving it our support. It will be necessary to ask many questions of the right hon. Gentleman. Even though the scheme may never come into operation except experimentally, yet the House of Commons will be failing fundamentally in its duty if it does not examine its details with the greatest care, in the light of the principles laid down by the right hon. Gentleman. On 14th September, at Newcastle, the right hon. Gentleman, speaking of the Territorial Army, said—

> "Under this scheme, we might manage to maintain in the field an army of 700,000, of 800,000, or even of 900,000 men. The thing is within compass. It is possible to devise a system for a very much larger expansion than has been contemplated."

While desiring that the money spent on the Army shall be well spent, I cannot believe that, given our naval supremacy, we shall best consult the interests of the country by maintaining ready for instant despatch an expeditionary force of 167,000 men, besides our large peace garrison in India, and a Territorial Army capable of expansion to 700,000 or 900,000 men. The necessities of the Navy must come first, and it cannot be conceived that the country will year by year consent to its present expenditure on the Navy, and at the same time contemplate keeping up this expeditionary force with this Territorial Army behind it, as well as the enormous peace garrisons of our ports across the seas. On that I take issue with my right hon. friend, and if it is attempted to pass over the enormous figures, and to say that of these great forces the expeditionary force alone is real, and that the other is a dream possibly of the future, then I say that we must press the right hon. Gentleman more closely in order to know what is to be the scale of expenditure upon the Territorial Army for which we are prepared. The right hon. Gentleman, I think, like Paul, has been a little open to the charge of being all things to all men. Just as Paul said—

> "To them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, that I might gain them that are without law."

So the right hon. Gentleman is a Regular to the Regulars, a Territorial Volunteer to the Territorial Volunteers, a little bit of a conscriptionist — [Mr. HALDANE dissented]—well, a friend of conscriptionists, and at the same time he is a leading pacifist to the pacifists. The right hon. Gentleman has stated in most emphatic terms that by this Bill he is erecting entrenchments and earthworks against conscription. But the Bill is being placed before the House on the advice of the Army Council, and the Army Council as individuals are in favour of conscription. ["No."] Two members of the Council have said so in public and the third leading Member said it in private on several occasions. It is notorious that the ordinary soldier at the present time is nothing but a conscriptionist. I do not think it is a real danger, but my right hon. friend is in the position of receiving support all round, and he quotes this support with approval. On 4th March my right hon. friend quoted by way of peroration, the declaration of *The Times* military correspondent; and it is notorious that the powerful articles of that clever soldier have contributed very greatly to the success of this scheme. This scheme will be carried undoubtedly, and it will be to that soldier that the great success of it will be in part due. It would, of course, be very largely due to the right hon. Gentleman himself, but *The Times* military correspondent was the right hon. Gentleman's chief backer in the Press. *The Times* military correspondent, in what he wrote, said that the scheme which he supported was a—

> "Leap in the dark. . . . It is better that we should know for certain that we cannot expect to create a serious national army by voluntary service than live in a fool's paradise."

My hon. friend the Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool said—

> "If the present scheme fails there are evil days in store for those who hold to the old ways of voluntary service, and the freedom of the subject."

The views that have been expressed by the supporters of two very diverse opinions—views of a similar tenor, show how necessary it is that the House should scrutinise the scheme closely. The War Office under this scheme are to get control of the Volunteers; but the form in which they are to be given that control is dangerous. A few years ago the Under Secretary for the Colonies wrote several letters to *The Times* in which he used language relating to the total misunderstanding of the Volunteers by the Regular soldier. My hon. friend wrote—

> "The War Office has always hated the Volunteers and sneered at them and despised them. That prejudice is still as strong as ever at headquarters. There is a feeling that but for the Volunteers we should have to adopt conscription, and then the War Office would have everybody's life and liberty to play with, which would make them very happy indeed."

The language used is, perhaps, too highly coloured, but the fact is that the Regular soldier has never understood the Volunteer, and it is accordingly urged that steps should be taken to prevent the Volunteer from being put under the Regular Army, bound hand and foot. I think the Volunteers ought to be represented on the Army Council itself. One of the reasons given for this prejudice by my hon. friend is that the War Office and the headquarters staff feel that the Volunteers stand between the country and conscription. There is, however, this difficulty about the scheme of my right hon. friend, that under it he destroys the present constitution of the Volunteers, and when once it is killed it cannot be revived. I believe that it will be very difficult to get the Volunteers to bind themselves for so long a period of service as that contemplated by the Bill. In the interim Report of the Committee on Officers it is pointed out that it will be—

> "Impossible for a young man of the professional classes to bind himself for longer than twelve months ahead."

But there will be the same difficulty with the working classes as well in respect of these long engagements. The Report of the Committee on Officers goes to prove and strengthen that statement, because it mentions a case where an experiment was tried as regards officers, and they say that the result of this appeal might afford a convincing proof of the statement they make, which is quite as true of the private Volunteer as it is of the officers. My right hon. friend, indeed, has failed to appreciate some of the advantages of the present voluntary system, which form a reason for going slowly and for examining closely the changes that are proposed. The right hon. Gentleman said that one of the scandals of our system is the non-correspondence of strength to establishment. Why? It may be so as to the Regulars and the Militia, but why as to the Volunteers? The establishment is merely nominal; it is fixed by the War Office, and corresponds to local feeling. It offers also this advantage, that in a period of strained international relations we can slowly, and without any mobilisation, recruit up to the larger scale. Why, then, get rid of that elasticity and adopt a cast-iron system? This is doubtless the view of the Regulars as to the Volunteers, which must have been adopted by the right hon. Gentleman without sufficient justification. Then as to the question of cost. The right hon. Gentleman has laid before the House the result of what he calls "a searching investigation," and he says that it will be best to put in everything, that "the Volunteers will be indemnified against cost" (which they certainly are not); and the right hon. Gentleman calls it an "approximate estimate," a "normal annual estimate." But no one will be found to defend that estimate now. The right hon. Gentleman began by cutting off all preliminary expenditure applicable to many subjects. There is, for example, the abolition of the Regular adjutant; but I think the House will insist on the retention of the Regular adjutant. The camp allowances are another item. There are many battalions in which the men receive payment at the present time. Some commanding officers can get men for a week without payment, but if they needed their services for a fortnight the men must be paid 4s. or 5s. [Mr. HALDANE dissented.] I have seen the figures embodying the finance of corps, and I assert that my statement is correct. The only doubt is as to what proportion of Volunteer corps payment does or does not exist. Then the statement goes on in these words—

> "It has been assumed that no payment of any kind is to be made for attendance at drill or musketry."

In this statement you do not "indemnify the Volunteers." But the Australian partially-paid system, which is so admirable a success, pays the Volunteer for every moment of his time; if they take him for a portion of the day they pay him for a portion of the day; and that partially-paid system is consistent with perfect self-respect on the part of the Volunteer. He does not look upon himself as a regularly-paid soldier, but as a Volunteer, who simply receives payment for his actual time. The Memorandum goes on to deal with separation allowances, and these are only to be paid to a portion of the non-commissioned officers and none at all to the men; but the men in the Volunteers in many cases require these allowances just as much as the non-commissioned officers. There is no allowance for ammunition to the Artillery or for stores to the Engineers. It has been said that before 1863 the Volunteers were not artisans, but a great many of them were. I myself belonged to a corps, an Engineer corps, after I left the Cambridge University Volunteers—and even before 1863 the War Office were already supplying stores for the Engineers—spades, shovels, and all the stores used in the battalion. The Memorandum distinctly states that there is no allowance of ammunition to the Artillery, or stores to the Engineers. Let me say two or three words more on these figures—illusory figures it seems to me. At this moment there are twenty-three Volunteer adjutants, not Regular soldiers, who are receiving the full pay and allowances of the Regular adjutant. Does the right hon. Gentleman think he will get in the future a man of business, a young attorney, to do the work, or any large portion of the work, now done by the adjutants, for £100 a year? The adjutants now receive pay and allowances which, at the lowest computation, comes to more than £1 a day. This can be tested by the figures of the country as a whole. My right hon. friend was asked what was the number of Regular officers serving as adjutants, and the answer disclosed that the cost worked out at nearly £550 a year on the average. So that it is to my mind idle to suppose that you will get a man of business who will turn out in uniform at all sorts of hours for £100 a year, and be a good man. Then as regards military discipline, it is undoubted that there will be enormous difficulty in the case of the Territorial Army in getting a Volunteer officer to maintain strict discipline over the Regular drill sergeants. The Regular adjutant can do that. I am convinced that my right hon. friend will have to give way upon that question at all events, just as his supporters in the Press have told us he is going to give way on the question of the Yeomanry. There is the question of camps, which my right hon. friend says is vital. If it is vital, and if you are going to train more, I am satisfied that the House of Commons will take the view that you will have to pay more, and that it will not be possible to cut down the allowances in the way proposed. I should like to deal with the matter of garments. It is material to the Estimate which has been laid before the House. My right hon. friend gave an Answer to a Question the other day which I could not for the life of me understand. There was something about 11s. 5d. in it, and I tried to make out what possible garments you could get for that amount. I am relieved from all difficulty on that point by the Answer which the right hon. Gentleman gave to-day that the amount was over £2. The sum is not for a walking out suit or a review suit, but for an ordinary working suit. You forget that the men in camp must have clothes to change into. You must let them have, not only their working suit, but their review suit and walking out suit. Now that matter is under consideration, like a great deal of the finance of this scheme. The Secretary of State for War was asked a Question on the subject on 25th March, and in reply he said—

> "The question as to whether any extra grant is to be made towards the purchase of uniforms for review and walking out purposes is still under consideration."

When pressed further my right hon. friend said—

> "It is clear that the public must provide these people with the clothing necessary."

But there is no money for it in the accounts, and that is another matter on which I am certain the War Office will have to give way. As regards Artillery ammunition, of course reduction was easy if you do not let the Artillery fire. They are at present in that position. The Secretary of State in reply to a Question on 22nd March said—

> "The training of the Artillery Militia will be of an exceptional nature during the present year. There will be no gun practice."

As a Member of this House I have for many years pressed for the creation of a mixed Artillery, as part of the Militia system if you like. I am one of those who believe that you are turning your Garrison Artillery into Field Artillery, and that during the hiatus, which may be a very long hiatus, the Artillery are not to receive ammunition and they are not to fire.

MR. HALDANE: My right hon. friend is not quite accurate.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I will not press that point. I believe it is not yet settled. Now as regards ranges. The matter of ranges is left in an extraordinary position in this scheme, and it raises a question which is most interesting to all Volunteers as to how far the War Office are looking forward to putting their hand into the public pocket through the county organisations. Some years ago some of us offered violent opposition to an attempt of the Lord Mayor to raise the cost of the Volunteers by public subscription. We held, and I believe the House of Commons will hold, that this service ought to be paid for by the State and not by private individuals. My hon. friend, who is so conspicuous and so good a Volunteer, asked how far the Volunteers were to be provided for by the Army Council, and how far by private funds. The hon. Gentleman showed how essential the question of ranges was in that respect. Paragraph 13 states—

> "No provision is made for initial expenditure for equipment."

It not only means equipment, but storage for equipment, which is often more costly than equipment itself. Some Volunteer battalions have equipment now, but the majority have not, and you cannot start the Territorial Army without a provision for equipment. You will have to start them at least as well off as the Militia at the present time. I think it is clear that depôt accommodation cannot rest in the position in which it is now, and that will require money. The officer scheme is a matter not only of cost but of principle. The Secretary of State has declared that this is to be a democratic Army, but the method proposed for officering that Army cannot be regarded as satisfactory taken as a whole. Take many of the men who have done the best work—and given the most time—I have in my mind a man who would have made the best officer I have ever met, a literary man of great distinction, but not of large income—the men who have been the real officers of the corps—these men have not been able to accept the position which their talents and labours deserve. Under a democratic scheme you ought to be able to do honour where honour is due. And to do that means money. These men must be relieved of all demands upon their private purse. These things are still in a state of flux. They are still vague in the figures which have been laid before us. At page 12 of the Memorandum issued yesterday you may read—

> "The proposed rates of pay and allowances for officers and men of the Territorial Army have not yet been finally determined; but broadly speaking, it is proposed to pay them, during the training period, at rates based upon the pay and allowances of the corresponding arms and ranks of the Regular Forces, in addition to ration and forage in kind, and to separation allowance for the families of non-commissioned officers. The rates to be paid in aid of the cost of messing will receive special consideration."

Lord Portsmouth in a speech on 21st March said—

> "He was not able at present to state what the amount of the annual bounty would be; that was a question which would be considered in Committee in another place."

That will be an important matter, as my right hon. friend well knows. His supporters in the Press have all told him that it is impossible to run his scheme on the money he estimates it will cost. The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head; but it cannot be done. The military correspondent of *The Times*, who has always supported his scheme, has said that it would need estimates at the least from £35,000,000 to £40,000,000 sterling a year. And that is without the £21,000,000 which the Secretary of State for India is spending on the Indian Army. It is useless to deceive ourselves on this matter. The Secretary of State for War has told us that the figures might vary, and that the decisions ultimately arrived at might modify the cost. Therefore, the House will not be doing its duty unless it presses the right hon. Gentleman to show precisely what the cost of the scheme will be, and on what scale the scheme is to be carried into effect. As to the representation of the Territorial Army on the Army Council, the right hon. Gentleman was not very clear in the alternative proposals he has put before the House. The absence of sympathy with the Territorial Army on the part of the Army Council is admitted. A Committee of officers presided over by Sir Edward Ward has spoken of "the absence of sympathy on the part of the War Office authorities." How are you going to meet that absence of sympathy? On 25th February the Secretary of State said—

> "Our proposal is that there should be a Committee to represent the interests of the Territorial Army."

Then on 4th March the right hon. Gentleman said that the civil member on the Army Council would have as his chief business in the future representing the county associations. Which was the right proposal?

MR. HALDANE: Both.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: When the right hon. Gentleman was asked who was to be the civil member of the Army Council the answer was: "He is, as a rule, a Peer in the House of Lords." The democratic character of the scheme will not be improved by that, seeing that the officers in the future are to come from the public schools like Eton and Harrow. As regards the Lords-Lieutenants, the Secretary for War desires to restore to them some of that military position which Mr. Cardwell took away. He said that the Lord-Lieutenant would, in future, be a very different person from now. I have no doubt that the only Lord-Lieutenant appointed since the 4th March when that speech was made would be even more military than his predecessors. Those of us who have had experience of Lords-Lieutenant have some doubt as to their ability in military matters. There is one Lord-Lieutenant at this moment whose only military exploit was driving his motor car through a unit of the Regular Army; and when the Commanding Officer spoke to him he said that it was impossible for him to stop the car, and that that was only the second time he had done it! There is very little that is democratic about this Territorial Army. If we are to attract the sympathy of the general public to this national Army it can only be by adopting the Australian plan of paying the artisan classes for all the time they are to give to the public services. Pay them for their loss of wages, and then their patriotism can be counted upon. In conclusion, I wish to say that while I entertain the gravest doubts as to the exact meaning of the scheme, I maintain that the expeditionary force is too large for the needs of the country; as regards the union of the services, I am attracted by it, but even given that union I hold that it cannot be accomplished on the scale suggested without the cost being very much greater than is proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I agree with much that was said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean, but would point out to him that the number of Volunteer corps whose officers pay their men four shillings or five shillings a day, when training, are very few indeed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover made a very interesting speech, and in the course of it he said that the scheme of the Secretary of State for War does not provide "an adequate force for home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field." The right hon. Gentleman has had great experience in Army matters. I remember the time when he was Under-Secretary for War, and I must say that the late Government made a fatal blunder, when the opportunity occurred, in not promoting him to be Secretary for War. If they had done that I feel sure that both the Regular Army and the Auxiliary Forces would have been in a very different position from that in which they are to-day. The right hon. Member for Dover put this dilemma, one of his own creation: You must he said, either (1) deal with your forces as they are, or (2) abolish your present system and adopt a compulsory system of training. That is not the position. Even if the scheme of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War goes by the board, the resources of civilisation are not exhausted. The alternation is not conscription. I maintain that the scheme does provide for an adequate force for Home defence, and also for the prompt support of the Regular Army in the field, and compares favourably with the futile attempts of his two predecessors at the War Office, which have led to such disastrous results in the Volunteer Force. If the scheme of my right hon. friend is not perfect, it at any rate holds the field: and it has this advantage, that it is formed on a voluntary basis. I compliment my right hon. friend on the fact that he has shown no disposition to rush it. He has wisely given the country time to think about it, to digest its details, and has shown himself disposed to consider the opinions of those who have given their services to the State in a voluntary capacity. As the right hon. Gentleman has shown himself to be amenable to reasonable criticism, I hope he will be prepared to modify any details which will not invalidate the underlying principles of his scheme. Approaching the scheme under the conditions of Second Reading limitations, I think that the two line Army plan is a wise one and can be given practical effect to. Perhaps the Secretary for War may not agree with me, but I believe that the proposal for the county associations is not an integral part of his scheme. The second line Army is a grand conception; and it provides a force suited to our needs; but we can provide for that second line Army and yet dispense with the county associations. There has been a good deal of loose talk and muddled thinking in regard to the Auxiliary Forces. We have been told that they are unable to meet the trained troops of Continental nations. Now, if that is so, it is not because the material is bad. The right hon. Member for Croydon, when Secretary of State for War, said in this House that the Volunteers formed the finest material you can find anywhere. It is not that the individual Volunteer is not highly trained. I admit that he is not as efficient as he might be. But that is not the reason why he could not meet foreign troops. The weak point is that the Volunteers have not been organised into larger units. I have not met with a single Volunteer, officer or man who objects to a high standard of efficiency if it does not interfere with the daily employment of the Volunteer. What is the scheme for this new Territorial Army? It is that a force is to be created consisting of fourteen mounted brigades, fourteen divisions of Infantry, with a full complement of cavalry and artillery and coast defence troops. I maintain that all that can be obtained without the interposition of county associations. By his scheme the right hon. Gentleman does not require a larger number of men than we have at present. His aim is that we should have as a second line a self-contained fighting force; that is a great advance on anything which has hitherto been proposed. There is no doubt that the training of that force is a very difficult problem; there must be a certain amount of elasticity, and to combine that with a high standard of efficiency is difficult. But the problem is one which can be solved. However, we must keep in view that these men are civilians, and their training must not interfere with their daily employment in civil life. A good deal has been said about camp training, and I do not undervalue that. Indeed I think my right hon. friend made a sad mistake this year when he abolished the fifteen days training even for one year. I think that will be prejudicial to a certain extent to volunteer efficiency. Although, however, I regard fifteen days training as the minimum which the Volunteers ought to undergo, we must have a certain amount of elasticity, and that is provided for under the Bill in having eight days training for those who are not able to do fifteen days. I remember the scheme of Mr. Brodrick which proved so disastrous to some of our best corps of Volunteers and which introduced compulsory camp training. Some of the best men cannot undergo a period of even eight days training, but these are the men who are very often intellectually and physically much superior to the great run of your Volunteers. An equivalent in drill is provided for them also. Then I have a word to say as to the county associations. I differ from the Secretary of State entirely with regard to the constitution, and in fact with regard to the creation of these bodies. We are in the happy position, however, in having led the Secretary of State for War a considerable way in my direction. I think we have at least arrived at the half-way house. The original idea of these county associations was that we should leave to them the whole control of the Territorial Army, and Lord Esher's Committee recommended that the associations should be entrusted with the entire administration and financial control of the Territorial Force within their area. Now, I hold most strongly that your Territorial Army, if you are going to give it a chance, must be established on a purely military basis. I know the objection that has been urged, and urged with considerable force, that the military man does not understand Volunteers. I think it is true that in the past he has perhaps undervalued the services which the Volunteer has rendered. A great change, however, has taken place in regard to that, and since the South African War there has been a different feeling between the Regular Forces of the Crown and the Auxiliary Forces; but I do agree most heartily with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, that if you are to have a Territorial Army you must have direct representation on the Army Council. The original scheme of the Esher Committee has not been given effect to, and I admire the alacrity with which my right hon. friend has taken up a sounder strategic position on this point, and I only hope that he will see that these County Associations, having been divested of command and training, are very much in the position of tame white elephants under the training of the General Officers Commanding; the entertainment being arranged and superintended by the Army Council. I most sincerely object to the War Office farming out its responsibilities to these County Associations, and I believe that even now they are to have far too much control. In the last Memorandum but two, I think, which the right hon. Gentleman has issued, that of 25th February, he concluded by saying that financial and administrative arrangements connected with the Territorial Forces were still to be under the Army Council although not conferred by Act of Parliament. I believe that they will be detrimental to the efficiency of the new force. It is a great step in advance that the constitution of these bodies is not to be statutory, that they are to be entirely the creation of the Army Council. Even so, the creation of these bodies will simply be like throwing sand into the gearing of a good machine, because so far as they exercise power they will kill initiative, and so far as they are purely ornamental they will be a delusion and a snare. The position of the Lord-Lieutenant at the present time is not unlike that which he will occupy under this scheme. It is not generally known, but at the present time the appointment to first commissions in the Volunteer Force is not in the hands of the Commanding-Officer; it is under the jurisdiction of the Lord-Lieutenant. A Commanding-Officer cannot appoint a new officer unless he writes to the Lord-Lieutenant of the County and asks him whether he wishes to exercise his right. If he writes back that he waives his right of nomination, than the Commanding-Officer can nominate. That is not generally known. These County Associations, instead of being a help to the scheme of my right hon. friend, which is on the right lines, will be a great disadvantage to it, and I do not wish to see it handicapped by unnecessary weights. Another objection to these County Associations is this—that so far as one can gather from the Bill the Army Council is to make different regulations for different areas. If the Army Council does so, it will be fatal to the efficiency of the force. You will have in many districts of the country merely half-trained troops and a want of uniformity which will make your Territorial Army of very little value. I think that under the scheme of my right hon. friend, the Militia, as we understand it, must go. [An HON. MEMBER: Why?] Well, it is going to be absorbed, and if the hon. Member had listened to the speech of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, I think he would have had conclusive evidence that that is so and the reason for it. It is to be absorbed by the special contingent and by the Territorial Army, but I must say that the right hon. Gentleman, so far as his Territorial Army is concerned, must depend upon the Volunteers. That being so, we must critically examine the conditions which he intends to impose upon that force. [Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Hear, hear.] My hon. and gallant friend the Member for Sheffield says "hear, hear," and I look back to the last Parliament, when I moved many Amendments on Volunteer matters and obtained the hearty assistance of my hon. and gallant friend; in fact, he did everything but follow me into the division lobby; that evidently was too great a strain upon his patriotism. I agree with many of the criticisms which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover has made in regard to this scheme, but I think they are not vital criticisms, because I do not think that the House quite realises that at the present time the Volunteer Force is under pretty severe conditions, and with regard to the six months embodiment after war has been declared our position will not be much more onerous than it is at the present time. It has been asserted that the four years engagement will be a serious bar to getting recruits, but at the present time it is three years, and I understand that in some corps the minimum is four years. Then the right hon. Gentleman opposite was very much concerned as to the position of the Yeomanry, but I think he has done that force great injustice. He has said that the Yeomanry will not come forward unless they get 5s. a day; that they are drawn from a class which will not submit to the ordinary pay and rations of the regular soldier. Has the right hon. Gentleman considered that in the Infantry Volunteers at the present time there is a class of men superior so far as social *status* is concerned to the average yeoman? We have University Companies in some of our battalions, and I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that the members of those companies in camp not only serve for the pay but do fatigue duty more cheerfully than others who ought to be more accustomed to that work. Therefore, I do not think the right hon. Gentleman is fair to the Yeomanry in saying that they will not come forward unless they get paid sufficient to give them the luxuries which they would get at home. A man who cannot exist on Army pay and rations is, in my opinion, not worth having. The right hon. Gentleman has been most unfair to that branch of the service, in his difficulty and dilemma in finding arguments against a scheme which he himself must see is a great step in advance. There is one objection that has been made to the scheme by my right hon. friend which I cannot understand, namely, that it will encourage a spirit of militarism. I think it will have entirely the opposite effect. It is in your professional Army, backed up by those who sit at home and shout and do not do any military service, that the danger lies. I have long held the opinion that if you do your own soldiering you will not be so fond of fighting. One can quite understand that those who bear the responsibility are much more careful in looking at the obligation which they have to undertake than those who do not. I am much astonished that from the Labour benches of this House should come an objection to the scheme of my right hon. friend. The Labour Members, in fact, are allying themselves for the moment with the advocates of conscription in opposing this scheme, and I think if they get hold of the idea which I have indicated just now they will find that their support of this second line army is the best bulwark that can be raised, not only against the spirit of militarism, but against compulsory service. I support this scheme because I believe there is an absolute necessity for a reduction in the national expenditure, and I think that, ultimately, this is the most economical way in which we can provide for the military necessities of the country. I do not commit myself to the conservative estimates of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War in regard to the cost of the Territorial Army. I think those estimates are very conservative indeed. This is a scheme which, if it is to be a success, will require a good deal more money than has been indicated by my right hon. friend. But in spite of all that, I think my right hon. friend is going in the direction of economy. It will lead to savings on the Regular forces. He is carrying out the true conception of a small Army suitable for our needs, highly trained, and fully equipped, supported by a much larger body behind it. I support this scheme because I believe it will be a bulwark against compulsory service. I think conscription is not only unnecessary but also entirely unsuited to our needs. I fully concur with what Mr. Cardwell said in this House in 1871, that to enter upon such a course would be distasteful to the country and extremely objectionable from every point of view, but I also join with those who have warned my right hon. friend to be very careful in this matter. I do not think there is any doubt but that the War Office is wedded to conscription. I do not, of course, suggest that they would interfere so as to interpose any obstruction to the success of this scheme, but as my right hon. friend is of a trustful disposition I would ask him to beware of the soldier tactician, because I believe these gentlemen may score off him in regard to the County Associations. If this scheme is carried out on its broad lines it will give us a second line force trained efficiently for home defence. It will also provide a reservoir from which we can draw in time of need. It has been said that we are not a martial nation but that we are a fighting race. That has been proved in every war. In no war in which we have been engaged has there been any lack of men volunteering for service. What we want are trained men who can give their services when called upon. And here let me say that I have always dissented from the views expressed by the Member for Croydon with regard to the Volunteers when the South African war broke out. In my opinion it cannot be too often stated that when that war broke out the Volunteers were prohibited from volunteering for service, and when, eventually, permission was given to them, every obstacle was placed in the way of the response being a success. No battalion was allowed to send a complete company under its own officers, and the whole thing was carried out in such a piecemeal way that the desire of the men to serve their country was stifled. That was felt when the time of stress came and when we sent out at 5s. a day men who had had no training whatever. We must endeavour to keep in touch with the first line. I agree with a great deal that has been said with regard to the necessity of keeping Regular adjutants with the Volunteers. We ought, so far as we possibly can, though the duties of the two forces may be entirely different, to keep them in touch with each other. And I think no better way can be found than to have instructors who are at the moment serving in the first line and who are quite *au fait* with all the new methods that are adopted and the changes that take place. It is of enormous advantage that there should be this interchange between the two forces. I will conclude my remarks with a quotation from the speech made in this House in 1803 by Mr. Pitt who said—

> "The Army must be the rallying point; the Army must furnish example, must afford instruction, must give us the principles on which that national system of defence must be formed, and by which the Volunteer Forces of this country, though in a military view inferior to a regular Army, would, fighting on their own soil for everything dear to individuals and important to a State, be invincible."

That is as true and applicable to-day as it was a hundred years ago.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): When the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs rose to reply to the speech of my right hon. friend the Member for Dover, I was a little disappointed that we had not had the advantage of hearing the Member of the Army Council who sits beside him. The hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the War Office as a private Member used to have a good deal to say upon these matters, but since he has taken office he has not said one word. He has, I believe, once been allowed to move the adjournment, but he has never made any contribution to these debates. It would have been a great advantage to have heard his defence of the approximate estimates of this proposed scheme. Before I pass to the matter under discussion I must refer to one observation which fell from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The right hon. Gentleman said that every body was asking what the Volunteers were for. That was a most unworthy question to come from a member of the Government. It was not a question put during the black weeks of the South African War, when within a very few weeks the Volunteer force was increased by 50,000 or 60,000; when 30,000 volunteered for service at the front and 25,000 were actually at the front. Since 1875 immense changes have taken place in regard to the Volunteer force. They are always ready to respond to every call the War Office makes upon them, and they have been highly complimented by those with whom they have served. Those compliments have been genuine compliments and not the clap-trap which is so offensive to the best men of the Volunteer corps. There is a Motion down in my name that this Bill shall be read a second time this day six months. That Motion I shall not have an opportunity of moving, but I cordially support the Motion moved by my right hon. friend the Member for Dover who has so much knowledge of the subject and of the War Office. I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will not think I approach this matter in any captious or Party spirit. When my right hon. friend the Member for Croydon was Secretary of State for War he knows perfectly well I did what I could to hinder him from embarking upon what I thought was a dangerous course, and the course I am taking now is entirely dissociated from any Party spirit. I greatly appreciate the enormous trouble that the Secretary of State for War has taken in going about the country and addressing Volunteer corps, distributing prizes and encouraging the corps and their officers. That being so, I am impelled to ask this question. Why does he now seek to abolish the Volunteers as at present constituted? Only the other day the right hon. Gentleman was good enough to publish the example of a battalion of 1,100 strong, and now he seeks to abolish them. If the Secretary of State for War had to deal with a different condition of things, with an entirely new country, if he was a German general forcing a new system on a conquered country, there might be something to be said for his scheme. But is it wise for him to abolish a system which has been in existence for 110 years, and has been established for fifty years on its present basis? Is it wise to abolish the Militia with hundreds of years behind them, and the Yeomanry, and all to obtain a new Territorial Force? I will not go into the question of the Militia which has been already so ably dealt with by my right hon. friend the Member for Dover, or into the question of the Yeomany which will be dealt with by hon. Members far better qualified than I am to deal with it. But is it conceivable, when we hear nothing but praise from the Treasury Bench and from the Front Opposition Bench, and, in the face of the present condition of the Yeomanry, when, we see every regiment full and have the inspecting officers saying they are thoroughly well trained and efficient, that we should abolish all this for the purpose of obtaining a so-called Territorial Force? If this scheme fails, as has been well said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, the re-establishment of the Volunteer Force on its present basis or the Yeomanry or the Militia is impossible, and the only alternative will be conscription or enforced military service. The hon. Member for Merthyr is not in his place, but he made an extremely able speech recently in which he said that if this measure had been proposed by a Conservative Government there would have been the greatest outcry against it by the gentlemen now forming the Government and the Liberal Party. The real fact of the matter is that here young men have an advantage of three or four years over their Continental contemporaries. They can make their plans at the most important moment of their lives without any consideration as to any claim upon them by the country. That is a great advantage. It is proposed to disband the Volunteer forces on their present basis, and I, for one, shall endeavour as far as possible, to prevent those forces from being scattered simply that they may be put under another name and called the Territorial Army. One or two points arise in connection with this matter. Who is the real author of this Bill? The Secretary of State appointed in the spring of last year a Committee of some forty-five members, chosen from highly distinguished officers of the Regular Forces, the general staff of the Militia, the Yeomanry, and well-known officers of Volunteers, together with several eminent civilians. That Committee met seven or eight times, and they gave a sort of general approval to some printed document laid before them concerning Lords-Lieutenant and county associations. The Territorial Army Committee was the name given to it by the Secretary of State, and Lord Esher was appointed Chairman. But since that time the Committee has never been summoned at all. On the 17th October, each member received a circular, which was not marked confidential, saying that the Secretary of State was engaged in the consideration of several important matters, but he hoped soon to summon the Committee again to confer with them. From that day to this, no member of the Committee has ever had any summons at all, or has ever heard anything whatever of this Territorial Force. That is most unlike the Secretary of State for War, who is courtesy itself. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean spoke of the right hon. Gentleman's great capacity for enlisting the sympathies of all persons with whom he came in contact. I will not attribute to the right hon. Gentleman the Biblical character given to him by the right hon. Baronet. At any rate, all who have had any dealings with him know that he is one of the most courteous of individuals, and that he is most anxious to do everything in an agreeable way. Therefore, I think the treatment of the Territorial Army Committee is one of the most inexplicable things I have ever heard of. The only suggestion I can make is, that the right hon. Gentleman saw that his Bill would never be approved, would never be endorsed or sanctioned by the Territorial Army Committee, and that he would be in possession of so many minority reports that it would be quite impossible to produce this Bill before the House of Commons. [AN HON. MEMBER: The Duma was dissolved.] My hon. friend says that the Duma was dissolved, but this Committee has never been even dissolved, and we have never had even a farewell speech or farewell benediction from the right hon. Gentleman. However that may be, the House will at any rate distinctly understand that the Territorial Army Committee, appointed to assist the Secretary of State, has no part or parcel in the shaping or forming of this Bill, the Second Reading of which is now under consideration. Then the question arises, who is the author of the Bill? I suppose the Secretary of State will say the Army Council. The Army Council is responsible for the Bill, and, therefore, we have to consider who are the Army Council. The head and front of the Army Council is the Secretary of State for War himself. Then we have the Financial Secretary, who was so communicative of brilliant ideas in this House, and who is now so silent. Then there is the Under-Secretary for War, the Earl of Portsmouth. I can hardly think, with all my admiration for the many qualities of Lord Portsmouth, that he is a modern Napoleon, and that he is the real author of this Bill. Then we come to the military members. First of all, we have an officer of enormous ability in General Hadden who has only just been appointed, and has had no experience whatever of the Auxiliary Forces. Therefore, he can have had very little share in the framing of the Bill. Then there are other two generals. The time of one has been fully occupied in organising the new General Staff, while the other has rendered brilliant service in India; and there is the Adjutant-General, General Douglas. I admit that General Douglas has a full knowledge of Volunteers, both in peace and in war. He was Adjutant for some time of the London Scottish, and he rendered very great service in that capacity. But I ask the Secretary of State for War very distinctly, has he received a Minute from General Douglas recommending him to disband the Volunteers as such? Secondly, has he recommended him to disband the Adjutants, of whom he was such a brilliant example, and who have done so much to keep the best corps up to the highest mark of efficiency? Has the Adjutant-General, in his Minute, recommended the Secretary for War to dispose of the property of the Volunteer forces, of lands and cash and so on, without any compensation, to the county associations? And, lastly, I ask him, has General Douglas, the Adjutant-General, with his knowledge of Volunteers, laid before the Secretary of State any Minute that under the Territorial Reserve Forces Scheme the men will be forthcoming? If he has, I would ask him to lay that Minute on the table; he ought to read it to the House. Now, there are one or two points of detail in connection with the Bill to which I should wish more particularly to refer. My principal objection to it is, that here we have, at the present time, an Auxiliary Force of 374,000 men, in round numbers—Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers. We have a war establishment of 503,000. I agree entirely with the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean that there is no disadvantage whatever in a disproportion between the actual strength of a force and its establishment strength; because it allows the force to be readily expanded without any public parade, and without any consent of Parliament—without calling Parliament together, without the Government being called upon to give any explanation which might cause offence to some foreign Power, and precipitate the very warlike operations which you are anxious to avoid by timely preparation. I think, therefore, that there is very great advantage in having a large military establishment, and a considerable margin between it and the actual strength. What does the Secretary of State propose to do? He proposes to remove this force of 503,000 men and to substitute for it a possible force of 300,000 men. He has now 374,000 men in the Auxiliary Forces, and he thinks if he gets all he asks for that he will obtain 300,000 men. On that ground alone his scheme is one which I think should not be proceeded with. But how is he going to get his 300,000 men under the new system? Some parts of his scheme are good, but I will not touch upon them. I think the scheme for the special contingents and the special reserves to be a good thing. I do not know whether it will answer or not, but I do not see any reason why it should not be tried, while keeping the Militia and Volunteers just as they are at present. There is no occasion, in order to try it, to disband the forces we have now. Whether it will succeed or not I do not know; but we had an experimental company last year, and from my own knowledge of what can be done in six months, I think it is very likely that it would be successful if the men were forthcoming. Neither the Secretary of State, however, nor I, nor anybody in this House, can tell in the least whether the men will be forthcoming or whether they will not. Still, I am perfectly willing that the plan should be tried. There is not the slightest need, however, to abolish the present Auxiliary Forces in order to attain that end. What ground is there for supposing, having disbanded the Militia, the Yeomanry and Volunteers, that a sufficient number of men will be forthcoming to form the force of 300,000 under the much more stringent conditions which the right hon. Gentleman proposes? Now as to the explanation which he owes to this House. It is not enough for him to say, "I think they will be forthcoming;" what is his ground for thinking it, and what reliable sources of information will he be able to lay before the House on the subject? Another point which I think of importance in connection with this scheme is the matter of the county associations. The county associations, to be a success and to attract good men, must have a free hand. But at every step the county association is to be under the guidance of the Army Council; as the Bill states, it cannot do anything really practical without the consent of that body. That being the case, I think that it would be extremely difficult to have satisfactory working by the county associations. This idea of county associations is not a new thing; it is not the idea of the Secretary of State at all; it is the idea of Elizabeth, it is the idea of Cromwell. If I remember aright, one of the great recommendations of this scheme to the Committee was that it was the idea of Cromwell, and that they were only re-establishing what Cromwell had done with a certain measure of success. Therefore, I will not quarrel with the county associations, but I do ask the right hon. Gentleman—and in Committee I shall do all I can to secure that he gives it—that the county associations shall have a much freer hand than is provided for in the Bill. The Secretary of State made a speech the other day—he has made many speeches, but he made one the other day in which he said that when he came to the War Office he found everything in a most confused state, and that everything was centralised in the Department. All I can say is that I have commanded different battalions of Volunteers for twenty-three years, and I have never found the slightest difficulty of any sort or kind. I have never had to ask the Government for a single sixpence of loan. But under this scheme nothing whatever is to be done without the formal approval of these county associations. That is sacrificing some of our best administrative ability and throwing it into the melting pot. I do not want to go at any great length into the details of the Bill, but there are one or two matters to which I should like to draw special attention. The first point I wish to raise is in regard to the legal proceedings. I desire to know what guarantee the right hon. Gentleman has that the men will be forthcoming for the Territorial Force after they have been dismissed from the Volunteers. The clauses dealing with legal proceedings are of extremely drastic character. Clause 23 lays down that—

> "Any offence under this part of this Act, and any offence under the Army Act, if committed by a man of the Territorial Force when not embodied, which is cognisable by a court martial shall be cognisable by a court

of summary jurisdiction, and on conviction by such a court shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or with a fine not exceeding £20, or with both such imprisonment and fine; but nothing in this provision shall affect the liability of a person charged with any such offence to be taken into military custody."

Is that one of the attractions which the Secretary of State for War holds out to the present Volunteers to join this new Territorial Force? Clause 24 is also a most extraordinary one. It provides that—

> "An officer or man charged with an offence which under this part of this Act is cognisable both by a court martial and by a court of summary jurisdiction shall not be tried by both of those Courts."

That is lucky. Then the clause proceeds—

> "Provided that a man who has been dealt with summarily by his commanding officer shall be deemed to have been tried by court martial."

Who ever heard of such a provision as that? A man whose omnibus is late or whose train has been delayed by the fog——

MR. HALDANE: My hon. and gallant friend is under a slight misapprehension. That does not apply to a time of peace.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: But if the right hon. Gentleman will kindly read his own Bill, on page 16 he will find that it applies to "any offence under the Army Act if committed by a man of the Territorial Force when not embodied."

MR. HALDANE: It only applies in case of embodiment.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Then is there going to be a court of summary jurisdiction to travel about with the Army in the field? Is there going to be a stipendiary magistrate attached to every corp under this new Territorial Force? Is this the attraction the Secretary of State for War is holding out for the Volunteers to join his new force? The present expense of the Auxiliary Force is, in round figures, about £4,400,000, and the Secretary of State for War claims that he will be able to procure his new force for £2,800,000. But how does he arrive at this conclusion? First of all he cuts down his 78,000 men to 74,000, but he takes no account whatever of his fourteen divisional generals, or the guns, rifles, or equipment which they will require. He takes no account whatever of capital expenditure which will be necessary on drill halls and ranges and other details. There is no provision at all for review or walking-out uniforms, which I feel certain will be absolutely necessary. Lastly, there is no account whatever taken of non-effective charges, or cadets, or rifle clubs. So far from the new Territorial Force being more economical, I am afraid it will be quite the reverse. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh has told the House that if this scheme is to be a success it will cost a great deal more, and when the right hon. Gentleman hears the statement from such an authoritative quarter, I think he ought to attach great weight to it. I feel sure that instead of being more economical it will be far more expensive than the present system. Now I come to Clause 28, Sub-section (*b*), which provides—

> "For transferring to the association any property vested in a Secretary of State for the purpose of any unit to which the Order relates."

I think that is an appropriation of private property which this House will never sanction, and which it ought not to sanction. The affairs of the Volunteers have in the past been administered with the greatest care; the Force have acquired considerable property by their own funds and by subscriptions from their friends and members, and now all this property is to be taken away from those corps which have administered their affairs so well, and is to go into the hotch-potch for the benefit of the county association. If the right hon. Gentleman wants an instance I only need mention the case of the Queen's Westminsters. Although the property of the corps has suffered considerable depreciation, the latest valuation puts it at about £14,000 in property and cash. The corps does not owe a single sixpence to the Government. Its only debt consists of a small sum due to an insurance company which the corps has tried to pay off, but the company will not accept the money, because they consider it a good business investment. Is all this property, and are all these ranges, drill halls, and cash, to be taken away from them, although their affairs have been well administered, and handed over without their consent to the county association? I think this is one of the most extraordinary proposals dealing with the property of a Volunteer corps which has ever emanated from any Government. I hope, however, that the Secretary of State for War will not think I am at all anxious to thwart him in his efforts to improve the efficiency of the Auxiliary Forces. I hope I have shown during a somewhat prolonged service that that is not my desire. There are some commanding officers I know who think that this Territorial Force will have a better *status* than the present Volunteer Force, but I very much doubt if those gentlemen have read the whole of the provisions of this Bill. There are thirty-eight clauses and innumerable sub-clauses, orders of the Army Council and rules which can be made subject to their being laid upon the Table of the House "as soon as may be." Hon. Members know that the laying of orders and rules on the Table is a very infinitesimal protection, because few people know they are there, and the Government has sole charge of the time of the House. Consequently it is almost impossible for any hon. Member to get an opportunity of calling attention to rules so laid. There are some good points in the Bill, but as regards the Volunteer Force, I think it is not a scheme which ought to go through. I disagree entirely with those who say that the scheme ought to be given a trial, because if it should happen to fail there is nothing before us but conscription, and I will do everything I can to prevent conscription from being forced upon this country. In the past the Volunteer Force has saved us from conscription. I know that at the present time there is a formidable party urging conscription, and almost the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's advisers are in favour of it, because they see that after the failure of this Bill conscription is an absolute certainty in the near future. For these reasons I support the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, and if the Second Reading is carried I shall do all I can to amend the measure in Committee so as to avoid some of the deterrent influences which I feel will prevent this scheme's being a success.

*MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I will not follow my hon. and gallant friend into the details which he has laid before the House, although the statement he has made is of great weight and interest, because I think it will probably be much better to reserve such criticisms till we reach the Committee stage. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover has made out his case for rejecting this Bill on the ground that it will provide neither an adequate force for home defence, nor a proper support for the Regular Army in the field. What does this Bill really set out to do? What is the change that it makes? I do not think there is any real change in calling things by new names; therefore I approach this subject from a totally different point of view from most people, because I see no fundamental difference in the Territorial Force which is to be constituted, and the present Volunteers, the Yeomanry, and the Militia. What does this Bill do with the new force? It at least gives the Auxiliary Forces something which the present force lacks, and which I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover must admit are absolutely essential for any force taking the field, viz.:—cohesion and mobile artillery. This is an entirely new proposal and will make an entirely new force in this country. Hitherto we have had our Regular Army for service abroad and for the defence of this country. Practically we have had a school of arms in the Auxiliary Forces, but in no sense whatever have we had an Army. I support my right hon. friend entirely on these points, although I differ from his proposals in so far as they involve the retention of such a great number of Regular troops in this country. I support him in creating a Home Army, because after all this is the crux of the whole matter, and I am convinced that only by this method can we have security and at the same time effect a reduction of the military forces of the Crown. I must say that I only urge a reduction in the Regular troops because I am firmly convinced that unless we reduce their number, public opinion will force us to reduce the Navy, and that would involve complete and utter disaster. Why does the right hon. Gentleman propose to have so many as 167,000 men for his expeditionary force? Even the Leader of the Opposition has told us that such a force is not required for anything except a Continental enterprise which he doubts the wisdom of providing for. I think the real reason why this number is provided is because the men are there for the purposes of the Cardwell system, and as they are there he rightly thinks they ought to be organised into something useful. When we have asked, as I have ventured to ask frequently, supported always by my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean and many younger Members, for a reduction of this force, we have always been met by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and I believe by every conspicuous Member of the Opposition and by some Members on this side of the House, with the statement that you cannot leave this country bereft of defence, and that you cannot rely wholly on the Navy. I agree, and I say that we cannot rely on the Volunteers because they are in no sense an Army. I think if we looked to a country where they have created an auxiliary army we might see what a great economy we might effect in this country by doing the same thing. A few months ago by the courtesy of the Swiss Government I was enabled to view the Swiss manœuvres. I was in a company of officers from almost every European army. That army has a training longer than our own Auxiliary Forces, but not very much so—six weeks originally for the infantry and sixteen days every alternate year. Is that army in point of fact a success? It is quite extraordinary the efficiency to which that army has attained. Every officer of the Continental armies who was present—officers who were naturally somewhat hostile to the idea of the success of an army so different from their own—testified to the extraordinary success of that army. It is in the one particular which our Auxiliary Forces now lack, namely, artillery, that they so greatly excel. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition threw some doubt during the last debate on an assertion of mine that it was possible to make an effective Volunteer field artillery. I think the answer would be "Look at the Swiss army. Their drivers are excellent and their practice is beyond all praise." Of course it is true that a portion of this artillery is composed both of officers and non-commissioned officers who have had a longer training and that that would be the case under the scheme of my right hon. friend. Well, you may say "But would an army like the Swiss army, if we had it here, serve actually to both prevent the danger of invasion and to calm the public mind?" The answer might be, "It would not, because it is not proposed to give it the same length of training." But surely those critics have forgotten this. If it be true that the value of a soldier depends on the length of his training it must also be true that the troops of any possible invader are inferior to our own Regular troops at home, or inferior to the 130,000 Regular troops at present in this country. Directly there is the least prospect of these Regular troops being sent out of the country, this Army with transport, and artillery would be embodied and would be able to pile up that training which is considered so essential. And if it be remembered that it is most unlikely that we should embark 160,000 with all their provisions, stores, and artillery, until at least six weeks have elapsed, it will be seen that before the danger of invasion has to be met by the Territorial Force it will have piled up the six weeks service given in the Swiss army which is admittedly such an extraordinary success. Two hon. Members opposite have whispered the word "compulsory." They say that the Swiss army is a success because it is based upon compulsory service. It must be admitted that compulsion is wholly bad from the military point of view if you can get the men by voluntary service. The problem of war, and especially modern war, is to get men with hearts in the job who will avoid the temptation, the almost overwhelming temptation, to surrender in the moment of supreme danger which supervenes at an early stage in modern battle, and if therefore by the principle of voluntary service you can eliminate from the Army even in peace time the people who do not want to fight and still keep the requisite number of men, it is clear that you will be more formidable than if you force into the ranks the willing and the unwilling. Under your voluntary system you eliminate even in peace time the man who is determined not to fight. That is a very great asset, and if any hon. Member reads Sir Ian Hamilton's second volume he will find that the same thing is stated by more than one Japanese officer, though in different terms. There is no advantage under compulsion by itself. The selfish loafer may possibly be advantaged by serving in your Army. On that, I express no opinion. But it is certainly bad for the Army to have loafers, and if you can eliminate them by voluntary service so much the better. If you fix the number of men at 300,000, I should say that the odds are that you can, because, as has been pointed out, we have 374,000 men in the Auxiliary Forces at somewhat similar rates of pay and allowances under similar advantages and obligations to those proposed by this scheme. If there are differences they can be amended in Committee. If you get 374,000 men to serve in the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers, on the strictly voluntary principle, and if you get them to give a week or a fortnight in the case of the Volunteers, a month in the case of the Militia, and eighteen days in the case of the Yeomanry—and above all let it be remembered that you have drills all through the year, attendance at lectures, and staff rides—if you get all that under the voluntary system, and if you will only give the force artillery, without which it must be defeated, but with which it can fight on equal terms with any foe, you can certainly expect to get the numbers for the proposed new force under the voluntary system, and after six weeks it must be a useful force unless you are to assume that Englishmen are less apt than the Swiss for military service. I support the right hon. Gentleman in endeavouring to set it up, believing that it is essential and that in the long run it will lead to great economy. I agree with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and others that it cannot be done for the sum which the Secretary of State for War suggests. It is not a matter, it seems to me, of very great substance, for if you can get complete security in the public mind, and enable yourself, therefore, to reduce your Regular Army to such a size that you could give the soldier the same advantage of employment in after life as you give to-day to the sailor, the spending of a million or two would be worth while for the advantage of the Army, and from the financial point of view for the advantage of the State. I do not think it can be done for the money, and I will tell the right hon. Gentleman why. I shall instance the Yeomanry, having served for eighteen years in that force. The right hon. Gentleman wishes the Yeomanry to serve at the rate of 1s. 5d., and everyone sympathises with his desire that all branches of the Territorial Army should be approximately on the same level. It is not money that makes them serve; it is in most cases laudable motives of patriotism. But in point of fact horse soldiers cannot be obtained in any country at a small rate. My right hon. friend will naturally think of the Swiss army, since the cavalry receive approximately the same pay and allowances as in other armies. He may think that that is an argument on his own side, but really I think it is against him, for the Swiss soldier receives far more than our Yeoman gets to-day. He gets a horse from the Government by paying instalments at such a small rate that he gets undoubtedly far more than our Yeoman to-day. I must say he is a most gallant person who is prepared to ride a perfectly strange horse over a mole-hilly field, with a gun in one hand. My right hon. friend might give his attention to the subject of horses and he might adopt a similar method to the Swiss. It will not be cheaper; it will be more expensive than the present plan, but the advantages to the Army will be so great as fully to compensate for its adoption. What would be the changes in the three different branches? In the case of the Militia, they will become, I hope, part of the Territorial Army. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover based most of his opposition on the Militia point of view. The Duke of Bedford has denounced the Government for destroying the Militia, and rightly pointed out that the Militia did good service in the South African War. That was because they were Englishmen and not because they were Militiamen. The Militia is unsuited to our industrial needs except in some parts. In some parts of Scotland fishermen might spare the month required for training and still remain useful members of civil society. In Durham, and in some parts on the borders, there were certain miners who could well afford to spend a month in training and still remain useful members of civil society. But with those exceptions it is immensely difficult for any man—

and I challenge contradiction—to serve in the Militia and still remain a useful member of the civil community. He cannot possibly spare a month every year. The man who succeeds in peace is the man who succeeds in war, and if you want to fight battles effectively, you must use the best and not the worst of the population. It is useless to have a Territorial Army on a basis which will debar the most useful members of society from belonging to it. Reform the Militia, if you must, by altering the terms of service. Our new territorial force is accordingly to serve for that period, and the Volunteers will take on the obligation which the Militia have to-day, while the Militia will take on the period of training of the Volunteers. I cannot see where there is any need for alarm. A fortnight's camp has always been successful; but experience has shown that the men cannot go into camp for a month. This scheme has been attacked by two schools of thought—by those like Lord Roberts and Lord Milner, who believe that no scheme not based on compulsion will be adequate for the defence of this country and the Empire. For my own part, I venture to say that compulsory service for home defence would imperil and weaken our Imperial position. Of course if any one were to come here and propose compulsory service for oversea garrisons or conscription for service on the Indian frontier his proposal would be entitled to respect as a solution of the real problem that faces us, although I would oppose him on the grounds that it would be a gross interference with the liberty of Englishmen; but conscription for home defence only would be a hindrance, not a help, to our oversea obligations. We have to send 17,000 to 20,000 men across the sea every year in time of peace, and as many as 400,000 in time of war; but France and Germany who have compulsory service have not to send a tithe of the men we have to send across the sea. Look at the difficulty that France had in despatching troops to Madagascar and even to Algeria. I have read much literature on the subject, and I can assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that France, with compulsory service, appears to find more difficulty in sending 5,000 men across the sea than we find in sending 50,000. So it is with Germany. The difficulty in getting a sufficient number of men to volunteer for warlike operations in South West Africa caused the German Government the gravest embarrassment; and the difficulty of maintaining their quota of the International Expedition for the relief of the legations at Pekin was considerable. I suppose that the explanation is to be found in the tendency of compulsory service of any kind to sap the spirit of self-sacrifice. That has been the effect in France and Germany, and it was the effect in this country a hundred years ago. I see the right hon. Gentleman opposite raises his eyebrows; but we had compulsory service for home defence a hundred years ago; and if he reads history he will find that compulsory service for home defence prevented young fellows from volunteering for foreign service abroad. It is most essential to have a force which will make invasion of this country impossible, but I believe that compulsory service for home defence, far from being an advantage, would be a disadvantage. It has been said that the scheme of the Secretary of State for War is un-democratic and anti-democratic. So far as it is both, I would oppose it. I am not a Lord-Lieutenant's man in this matter. I think the Lords-Lieutenant should be elected by their fellows, but that after all is a detail. The truth is that the Auxiliary Army has never got on with the War Office, and by the means of the county associations you do provide some kind of buffer between the Auxiliary Army and the War Office. I do not contend that the scheme is perfect; I do not think that the county associations, as it is proposed to create them, will take all the interest in the Territorial Army which might be desired; but I think a step is being taken in the right direction, a democratic direction. Then, as to the officers of the force, I agree with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, that in this matter our Army is the least democratic of all European armies. In all other armies, even in Prussia, some considerable proportion of the Army officers first serve in the ranks, and rise by promotion. All officers pass through the ranks in the case of Switzerland. That system is good for the officers, and also good for the men. I hope that after the Territorial Army has been created we shall adopt the truly democratic principle of making all men begin at the bottom and serve through all ranks, obtaining their promotion by proficiency, the system which acts so admirably in Switzerland. I recognise that the right hon. the Secretary of State for War may say that he cannot overload his Bill with such details; but I maintain that his scheme will never be a great success unless it is founded on a democratic basis. I do not for a moment suppose that any Member of the House approves of every clause in the Bill, but a Second Reading should be given to it. I believe that the people of this country are sick to death at the perpetual disputes between politicians and soldiers, and they are anxiously waiting for a plan for the settlement of this great problem, and if that plan appeals to them there is no limit to the sacrifice that they will make for the defence of this country and the Empire.

*VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said that he agreed to a certain extent with the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Abercromby Division that if this scheme were carried to its maturity it would provide for the security of our country; but it would take four or five years experience to determine if it was sufficient or not. He hoped the Bill, when threshed out in Committee, would be made a workable and good measure; and that it would render our position as a nation even more unassailable than he believed it to be at the present time. He could not say that hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition Benches approached this Bill in a Party spirit. The question which interested them was whether the scheme would fulfil the hopes of its originators. He himself was too deeply interested in the Army to care from which political Party an Army scheme emanated, so long as it improved the Army. He recognised the great boon which such a scheme as that now before the House would confer on the country if it could be got into real good working order; but he believed that under present conditions it was impossible to provide a force of 300,000 men in the way proposed. He ventured to think that the Foreign Secretary attached too much importance to what he called public or patriotic spirit. The public spirit which was shown in face of a definite danger to a certain extent became dormant when the question was only one of preparation against danger. He did not deny that patriotic spirit would be found to be existent when a definite danger had to be faced, but the spirit lay dormant when the question was preparation against a possible danger. If he were convinced that the scheme was for the education of the male population and would enforce upon them the idea that it was the first duty of everyone to take some part in the national defence of the country, and that it was only by a stroke of luck that he was not called upon to act in that capacity, he would give the scheme his hearty support. But he did not believe that that would be the result. That could only come about from a scheme of universal service known by the name of conscription, and he had no desire that day to dilate on the many reasons for and against that system. In his opinion the Bill depended too much upon the idea that the incentive to join the Army and the Auxiliary Forces had been self-sacrifice—the idea of doing something patriotic. He did not believe that that had been the idea, and he did not believe that it ever would be. He might claim, he thought, a small experience both in the Volunteers and in the Regular Army, and he could only say from personal experience that the incentive to join the Regular force certainly was not the patriotic spirit, to a great extent at all events, but various exigencies of gaining some livelihood. With regard to the Auxiliary Forces, however, it was to some extent different. A number joined, it was true, from a patriotic spirit, but he believed the majority joined because their friends belonged to the Volunteers, because to join was considered a good thing to do, and because members of the force had uniforms in which it was possible for them to walk out when not engaged in military duties. When the conditions were made harder, as they would be in almost every case, and to a certain extent less remunerative, he could not see how a force of 300,000 men was going to be evolved at the call of the Secretary for War. It was obvious that the scheme abolished the Militia, and he was at a loss to understand how it was possible for the Yeomanry to survive when the conditions under which they were called upon to serve were made harder and the remuneration smaller. With regard to the great bulk of the Yeomanry he did not believe that it was possible for men to give up their employment unless they received some adequate remuneration for the trouble and loss of employment which they incurred. As regarded the county associations he admitted that at first sight it was a very attractive scheme that those connected with the soil and employers of labour should be called upon to undertake the duty of collecting a territorial force in the county in which they resided. But on consideration it became obvious that the county associations meant the establishment of forty or fifty War Offices, each with a Budget, clerks, comptrollers, and a paid staff which would be suitable for the expenditure of something like a hundred thousand pounds. He was ready to admit that the Lords-Lieutenant and the authorities of the various counties would make a most excellent advisory body, but he did not see how they could as an administrative body be looked upon as rendering efficient service. If the county associations were to carry out the duties which the Bill proposed it would be necessary for the Secretary for War to make a reduction of the War Office Vote, and also of the staff regulating the affairs connected with the Auxiliary Forces. He would certainly suggest that the local interest should be enlisted by having an advisory body for the purpose of assisting the general officer commanding. With regard to the amounts of money that the local associations would ask from the Army Council, he did not understand how it would be possible for those associations to realise their exact position in regard to expenditure. He did not understand how under that head there could be any uniformity whatever. He viewed with apprehension the authority granted to local bodies for the purpose of borrowing money, for it appeared to him that that could only be looked upon as a municipalisation of those associations. The duties of the county associations would be so manifold that the question that arose in his mind was as to whether it was proposed that the machinery of those local associations should be supported by local effort, or whether the expenses they incurred in arranging the various details, such as rifle clubs and cadet corps, should be defrayed by the War Office. [Mr. HALDANE was understood to assent.] He was glad he had cleared up one point. He thought that the county associations would have their hands very full and that they would have ample work in regard to the rifle and cadet corps in the counties to which they belonged. There was no denying that rifle corps and cadet corps were two of the most important items of national defence. He noticed that there was no regulation in the Bill in regard to the preliminary training of the Territorial Army. At the present moment the Militia training was laid down by Act of Parliament, but it might, under this scheme, by an Order in Council, be extended to thirty days. He thought that if the matter was left to the Army Council to decide, such a course would dissuade a great many from joining the force. The artillery was one of the most important branches of our offensive and defensive forces, but there had been no mention of the large number of men — 10,000—who were to form part of the striking force, and to be artillerymen trained on a Militia basis. He would like to ask whether they came under the Bill, and before the Bill went to the Committee stage he thought they should have a definite answer to that question With regard to mobilisation, the two most important considerations were with regard to artillery and officers, and it was obvious that neither of those two could be improvised at a moment's notice. No special arrangements appeared to have been made with regard to artillery, however, in spite of the example which was being set us by foreign nations in developing that arm. As to the officers, at the present moment he thought the Militia was short by 1,000 and the Volunteers by some 1,500. On mobilisation, also, the Army would require an additional 2,000, although the War Office had just reduced their strength by 400. That did not seem to show that they attached special importance to the question of officers. It was also proposed to absorb the present class of Militia officers into the third battalion. The question naturally arose how officers were to be obtained for the Territorial Army, and it seemed to him that there would be very great difficulty. The pay granted to the Yeomanry had been reduced, and that fact was bound to reduce the number of officers in that force. Then again, the conditions of service were made more onerous. The terms under which the Volunteers served were also more exacting, and there was an obligation to serve six months on mobilisation, which would certainly prevent many officers from joining who otherwise would have done so. If we were not to have compulsory service, there was only one alternative by which officers could be obtained, and that was by giving them additional payment. It was no use, to his mind, depending upon the so-called public spirit and patriotism, because people nowadays could not afford to be patriotic, and if we wanted officers we must pay them to enable them to obtain the military education which was essential to all officers in our military and Reserve forces. He thought some thing could be done by subsidising men who at present had not the time to enter the service. He believed the Bill would press more harshly upon the Yeomanry than upon any other portion of our Auxiliary Forces, and that was to be regretted when it was remembered that that force was reorganised in 1901 and was now in a satisfactory position, having risen since that time from 9,000 to 27,000. That clearly showed the benefit of the step then taken. At the present moment the ranks were full, officers were plentiful,and, what was better still, the inspection reports sent in by officers of the Regular Army were in nearly all cases favourable. To reduce that force to the level of the Volunteers, which appeared to be part of the scheme, would bring it back to the condition it was in before 1901. To his mind the importance of that point might be lost sight of in view of the general havoc which provisions of the Bill would enact, but it should be realised that at the present moment we had no actual reserve for our cavalry. It appeared to him to be folly to attempt to carry out a scheme which would destroy a thoroughly efficient force, which had certainly some claims to the consideration of the House, not the smallest of which was the liability to serve abroad. A further claim was its past service, which it was not for the House to ignore, and which, if they did ignore, they would find cause to regret. He had no desire to detain the House further. As he had said, if they could wake up one morning and find this scheme in thorough working order it might afford that security to the country which all thought most necessary, and for which they looked to some scheme to provide. But there was something else to be looked at, and he feared the Government were destroying the substance for a shadow. If the Bill passed its Second Reading, he could only say that Amendments would have to be moved for the purpose of ameliorating the conditions of the forces and preventing the present Auxiliary Forces from being starved out of existence.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) said the speech of the noble Lord who had just sat down only emphasised the observation he desired to make, that he deplored the fact that the Opposition had thought fit to move an Amendment which, if carried, would have the effect of rejecting the scheme of his right hon. friend. Having had an opportunity during the Easter recess of perusing and considering the Bill, he had come to the conclusion that both in scope and in principle it was wisely conceived. It was incontestably a great advance on any previous scheme, and it now only required the uniform and united patriotism of all classes of the community to realise as its result reasonable machinery for a military organisation to meet the needs of the nation and the Empire. As his right hon. friend had pointed out on a previous occasion, the Bill aimed at creating machinery to fulfil four purposes. The first two were embodied in the scheme for the Territorial Army, the first in the constitution of the county associations and the second in the constitution of the force itself. The other two purposes were the creation of a more reliable and expanding Reserve for the Regular Army. The chief charges made against the scheme of his right hon. friend had been more with regard to the portion of the scheme which dealt with the Reserve than to any other portion. The House had been told that the right hon. Gentleman was going to abolish the Militia. As he read the scheme his right hon. friend was going to do nothing of the sort. He was not going to abolish the Militia in any sense or form, but by his scheme was going to afford an opportunity to the force to transfer itself, both in its character and in its traditions, to the Territorial Army under such conditions that those who continued in that force could continue their civil life also.

At the same time the scheme proposed to raise all arms of the Territorial Force to the standard of discipline of the transferred Militia. He ventured, therefore, to make an appeal to those who were officers of the Militia, and who, therefore, had influence not only in their own battalions but in the whole Militia movement throughout the country, to enter into the spirit of the scheme with the same patriotic spirit which animated the proposals of his right hon. friend. If that were done he was certain the Militia *cadres* would transfer themselves in the manner in which his right hon. friend suggested. As he understood, the only difference would be that the duties the transferred Militia would be asked to perform in time of peace would be less onerous and more compatible with the conditions of civil life of the professional men engaged, while the same liabilities in time of war would be shared by all members of the Territorial Army. Nobody would deny that the Militia had, through no fault of its own, deteriorated in recent years. It had been the victim of a haphazard system of recruiting for the Regular Army. It had been bled for years for recruits for the Regular Army, and in later years it had found in the Volunteer force a successful rival in its recruiting area. The Militia for some years had been in the habit of providing approximately something like 12,000 men annually for the Regular Army. Those recruits had joined the Militia and had been enrolled as on the establishment, but in the majority of cases they had never been attached to a Militia regiment, but had been removed straight from the depot where they had been drilled as recruits, and had joined their battalion of the Regulars either at home or abroad. The Regulars would in no way suffer from this scheme, because the 12,000 men would be available from the new body known as the special contingent which would supply men ranging from 180 to 600 in number, who would have been drilled for six months under competent officers previous to their entering into civil occupation, and would then be enrolled in a Reserve for six years, during which time they would be liable to be called up in time of war, and periodically at the discretion of the Army Council. It would produce a Reserve to meet the necessities of the Army, a Reserve which approximated 70,000 or 80,000, and those, together with the Regular Reserve of the Army which would be drawn from the time-expired men, would give the Army a Reserve for mobilisation, and for filling up the ranks during the first six months of war. In previous years we had had a seven years service, but we had never had a separate establishment to secure this extra Reserve to come behind the time-expired men. Then we had had a three years service which gave a very large Reserve, but which had to be abandoned, because it could not economically fill up the necessary drafts. It was argued that the new Reservists would not be sufficiently efficient in their training to meet other trained troops in the field. But it must be remembered that the men from the special contingents would not be asked to go into the ranks at the outbreak of war, but would be trained for four months on the outbreak of war and would then be drafted into the depleted ranks. The scheme was capable of very large expansion in times of great national emergency. There would be a greater number of depots for training purposes, and in times of great national emergency there would be no limit to those who might go into training in those depots. That could not be done under the present system of the Militia, except by asking for a Reserve consisting of units. All that the Militia battalions could do in times of national emergency under the present law was to volunteer as units to serve at the front. All modern scientific opinion was on his side when he said that a draft, however little trained, was far preferable for fighting purposes to an ill-trained unit. All experience bore that out. In the Russo-Japanese War the Japanese relied entirely on drafts to fill up the ranks at the front, for the untrained men who went to the front and fought beside trained men under competent officers soon found themselves efficient soldiers. The Russian Army, on the other hand, insisted upon a system of reserves going out in semi-trained units, and those semi-trained units, when they came alongside the depleted units, were not half so good as the units who had been out there for some time. Again, in the American War, the generals had only been in the field some months when they realised that semi-trained units were simply stumbling-blocks for fighting purposes. It might be laid down that 500 semi-trained drafts were better than a thousand men in a semi-trained unit. By his scheme the Secretary of State abolished the idea of the Militia volunteering, asked the Militia force to transfer itself to the Territorial Army, and at the same time started a special contingent in which men would be trained and fitted to join the ranks of the Regular forces during the time of emergency. It was proposed that a large number of men should be supernumerary to the ranks, and that their duties should be of an essentially civil character. Six divisions in the field would require about 30,000 men—telegraphists, railway transport, Army Service Corps, and so on. Those men could be drawn from the civil ranks, and could be more usefully employed in that way than the Regulars themselves; and there was this advantage under the scheme, that they would only be paid during the time that they were up for military training—and not all the year round—while they would be able to take up official positions, according to their occupations, in those various services which were so essential in modern warfare. He did not think that too much stress could be laid upon the point that, whilst they wanted to effect economy in time of peace, they wished to establish machinery which would be rapidly and efficiently expansible in time of war. Assuming that we were committed to a great war, we should have the Regular Reserve to be called up at once. With the outbreak of war the mobilisation of the Regular troops to war strength would absorb very nearly the whole of the Regular Reserve, whilst it was estimated, from experience, that with six divisions in the field the whole of the remainder of the special contingent Reserves would be absorbed during the first six months. That at any rate was what they might have to face in the event of a great war. All that was asked now, therefore, was that they should give a fair chance to this scheme for a special contingent, which, he considered, was in itself an improvement on any other scheme. If the Militia, as he hoped they would, consented to transfer themselves to the Territorial Army, he did not suppose that his right hon. friend would hold out with regard to a question of title, or in reference to the Militia retaining its name and traditions, assuming that they transferred themselves in any considerable numbers; they would have the Militia, Volunteers, and the Yeomanry brought together upon one basis of liability, and assimilated upon practically the same conditions. The real test of the success of the Territorial Army, of course, would be how far his right hon. friend was able to get the men. He could not himself see that there should be any great difficulty; because the right hon. Gentleman was diminishing an establishment of over 370,000 to 300,000. That diminution meant that many who had served usefully and honourably in the Auxiliary Forces in the past could hardly to-day be looked upon as efficient soldiers, and the weeding out of those would really leave an efficient element for the Territorial Army. A great deal would depend on the work done by the county associations. They would have to discriminate whether it was possible, in their own districts, to call out the men, or whether they would recommend to the Army Council that particular battalions should be called out for seven or fourteen days. They would have to go very closely into the matter of pay, because under our voluntary system the whole question of the men largely depended on the subject of pay. He strongly recommended his right hon. friend, as he had done on the First Reading, to bring the question of pay to something like a uniform standard. They wanted a wide field for recruiting for the Territorial Army, and if they paid one arm a great deal more than another they would set up a preference which would have a deterrent effect on recruiting for the other arms. At present the relative standards presented considerable anomalies. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had told them that in some Volunteer battalions the pay was 5s. per man a day. He had made careful investigation, and had never heard of such pay being given. [AN HON. MEMBER: Two shillings and sixpence.] Half-a-crown was a long way from 5s. He found, after careful investigation, that the rate of pay was between 1s. and 2s. a day, and in some Volunteer battalions there was no pay at all. The pay of the Yeomanry, 5s. 6d. a day, had been criticised. In future the right hon. Gentleman proposed that rations should be provided by the Government, also the camp equipment and other expenses. In most Yeomanry regiments 3s. a day was deducted for mess expenses, camp equipment, and so on, and, working it out, it seemed that the right hon. Gentleman's proposal only made a difference of about 1s.; and that being so, he urged that it would be no real deterrent on recruiting for other branches of the Service if the right hon. Gentleman, in a generous spirit, allowed the Yeomanry that extra shilling. The question of pay went to the root of the matter. The young bachelor could probably afford to go out for seven days or a fortnight, and could arrange with his employers so that he would not suffer while enjoying the great benefit of training. But with the married man it was a different matter. He left his wife and family behind; he might have 30s. or 40s. a week at his trade, and if he went out for training his wife and family might have to suffer great inconvenience and privation. He suggested that in the case of married men the right hon. Gentleman might establish some system of separation allowance. It would probably be better to make a separation allowance for the wives and children of married men in the Territorial Army than to raise the pay all round. The further objection has been raised that in the event of war it would be found that a large number of men in the Territorial Army, on its being mobilised, would be the very men who would be required to undertake extra work in civil professions, and that therefore the scheme would break down. That was not a defect of his right hon. friend's scheme. It was a defect of the voluntary system. Where there was a system of universal training under which all men underwent training in their early years that defect was entirely removed, but at the present time this country would not countenance anything of the kind. Whatever scheme was propounded they would always have to face the initial difficulty at the time of mobilisation of the Territorial Army of asking men to come forward in the interests of their country, and that was bound to cause dislocation in certain industries. The plan of the right hon. Gentleman, in his judgment, as far as it went, was a great advance on any other scheme. He hoped that as time went on the present expeditionary force of 160,000 men would undergo considerable reduction, because it was a much larger force than was anticipated. He hoped as the Territorial Army was organised that there would be a gradual encroachment upon the Cardwell system by further reductions in the Regular troops. He believed that the Territorial Army would cost more than the right hon. Gentleman had estimated, but that was a detail for Committee. He hoped the House would forget in regard to this question that it was a Party assembly and bear in mind that it represented the nation. He trusted that all hon. Members would loyally join together and endeavour to produce the best scheme, and thereby establish a military machine upon a voluntary basis that would be sufficient for the needs of the nation and the Empire.

*VISCOUNT VALENTIA (Oxford) said that whether one approved of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman or not, one could not help admiring the courage with which he had brought forward these far-reaching proposals. Of course there were one or two very large "ifs" which had to be faced, and they had been referred to by almost every speaker. One of those "ifs" was as to whether the right hon. Gentleman would be able to get the number of men he required. Another was whether he would be able to obtain them at anything like the estimated cost. The right hon. Gentleman had propounded a scheme which, as far as some sections of the Auxiliary Forces were concerned, might work extremely well, but there was one branch of the Service with which he had been connected for many years, in regard to which he did not think it would work well, and that was the Yeomanry, to which the right hon. Gentleman looked to provide the cavalry for the Territorial Force. Before altering the terms of the present Yeomanry service it would be well carefully to consider what the Yeomanry had done in the past. The Yeomanry as he knew them a good many years ago were inefficient and almost useless, and the only excuse for their existence was that they were cheap. It should not be forgotten that the Yeomanry were reorganised later than any other service, and he thought the

Secretary of State for War would do well to consider carefully whether it would not be worth his while to leave that force as it was at present, and allow them to develop and expand under the scheme he was now putting forward. The right hon. Gentleman claimed that in all the proposals he had put forward with regard to Army organisation he had taken the soldiers into his confidence, and that he had relied a good deal upon the advice of those soldiers who were at the top of the tree. No doubt as far as the Regular service was concerned there could not be a more excellent source of information than the old soldiers afforded, but for the Auxiliary Forces he did not think the right hon. Gentleman could have gone to a more fruitless or useless source than to the old soldiers who were at the top of the military tree. He yielded to no man in his respect for, and admiration of the officers whose long and distinguished service had placed them in high positions at the War Office, but he happened to know their history, and he knew how incompatible their previous service was with an extensive knowledge of the Auxiliary Forces. During the years he had served in the Yeomanry he had attended a good many inspections of regiments year after year, and he had frequently met inspecting officers and colonels of cavalry regiments who had told him in conversation that they had never seen a Yeomanry regiment before. Although it was true that the Yeomanry had only been recently organised, it was, as a matter of fact, in a fairly efficient state at the present moment. He believed the right hon. Gentleman had said on a previous occasion that the Yeomanry at 5s. 6d. a day was an expensive luxury. If inquiries were made as to the price of hiring a man and a horse in any county in the country it would be found that the cost would be the same as that of the Yeomanry to-day. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool had told them that the Swiss auxiliary cavalry cost the same amount as the Yeomanry. He had made inquiries in the neighbourhood in which he lived, and he found that 7s. a day was the average price for the hire of a horse and a man. The contractors who were constructing a branch of the Great Western Railway in his district were now paying for a horse and man 7s. a day, and they did not get either a very intelligent man or a trained horse fit for active service. Attention had been drawn to the fact that the Yeoman provided for himself a great deal more than the Regular soldier, because he had to supply his own kit, boots, forage, and other things. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would find that the Yeomanry after they had been converted into the cavalry of the Territorial Force would be any cheaper; at all events, the difference in the cost would be very small. He was sure the Yeomanry would very much appreciate being left to serve on the same terms as they were on at present. No less an authority than Sir G. Fleetwood Wilson had calculated that a Yeoman cost £21 5s. 2d. and a Militiaman £21 19s. 3d. He did not know that there was any particular difference in their efficiency, but that comparison showed that the Yeomanry were not the most expensive soldiers, in spite of the higher rate of pay they received. He believed the Yeomanry of this country were as efficient as any auxiliary cavalry force in Europe, and, with the exception of their armament, they were now as efficient as it was possible to make any auxiliary mounted force in the country. The Yeomanry were still armed with the bayonet, which was a useless weapon for a mounted man, because it was impossible for him to make a proper use of it. During his service in the South African War there was only one occasion when the Yeomanry were called upon to fix bayonets, and his experience of the weapon was that they were used by the men for picketting pegs or opening meat tins. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to reduce the permanent staff of both the Militia and the Yeomanry. Whether the Militia would stand such a reduction or not he did not know, but he was confident that no such reduction was advisable so far as the Yeomanry were concerned, unless they were prepared to sacrifice a good deal of efficiency. It had been suggested that an enterprising young solicitor might serve as an adjutant at the salary of £100 a year. He was afraid that, on those terms, no solicitor who had a practice of his own and possessed sufficient knowledge to perform the duties with satisfaction to himself or credit to the force would be inclined to attach himself to a Yeomanry regiment. The Yeomanry were considered efficient not only by the right hon. Gentleman himself, but by all military critics on whose opinion he relied. If they were an efficient and popular force, they were also a Territorial Force, both as to officers and men, and in that respect they fulfilled the idea of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman as to a Territorial Army. Surely it was rash to throw away the whole of that branch of the service, and to make it impossible for officers and men to remain in the new force, which would be reduced both in strength and in efficiency.

*Mr. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate) said he agreed with several hon. Members who had expressed regret at the Party spirit in which this question was approached by the Opposition. He further regretted that those Members on both sides who were officers, or had been members, of the Regular or Auxiliary Forces had not met together earlier to consider, without in any way binding themselves, what points they might suggest as improvements in the scheme. He was satisfied that the Secretary of State for War desired to take the sense of all Parties in evolving a scheme which would be satisfactory to the House, and, therefore, permanent. In the criticism that day there had been a tendency to deal with the scheme too much in detail and to foreshadow the destruction of the whole or parts of the Volunteer Forces as they now existed. He did not think that there need be any fear of that sort. He did not think there was any reason to suppose that by this scheme the Militia would be destroyed. The Militia would have an opportunity of serving in two ways. One part, which desired to do so, would give more time, and would therefore receive more money for the work which they did. The remaining portion would join the Volunteers and the Yeomanry, as known to-day, in forming the proposed Territorial Army on what might be called a mild Militia basis. He believed the scheme provided for a well-equipped, highly-efficient, and on the whole economical expeditionary force. He himself thought it was too large a force. By means of the Territorial Army the scheme also provided for completely organised cavalry brigades and infantry divisions distributed throughout the United Kingdom, ready to serve at any given moment. Those who knew about the present condition of the Auxiliary Forces knew that, large as they were in numbers, they were to a great extent useless. The money spent on them was to a great extent wasted because they were not organised and equipped and in a condition which would enable them to take the field. As to the cost of this Territorial Army, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had allowed sufficient money for the work it would have to do. Roughly, he calculated that the present cost of the Auxiliary Forces, as a whole, worked out at about £12 per head per annum, while that of the whole of the new Territorial Army, apart from that specially trained portion which was to be joined in time of war to the Regular Army, worked out at about £9 5s. He did not think they could expect to get the new force to undertake harder conditions for less money. The present cost of the Yeomanry worked out at about £21 per head per annum, while the cost of the cavalry of the Territorial Force would be, under the scheme, about £14. That seemed rather an unnecessary reduction, considering the numbers with which the right hon. Gentleman was dealing. If the right hon. Gentleman were willing to pay as much for the Territorial Cavalry as he now paid for the Yeomanry, it would not cost more than about another £130,000 beyond the amount he had laid down in his Paper. He thought it would be impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to obtain the force at the cost at which he hoped to get it. It was never possible to get men to do casual work at the same rate as permanent work. In the case of the cavalry it was proposed to take the men for a certain portion of the year, and to ask them to give up their time for drill, during the year just as the Yeomanry did at present. They could not be expected to do that without a rather better scale of pay than was given to men in the similar force permanently engaged. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that it would only be necessary to provide the members of the whole of the Territorial Force with one suit of clothes or one uniform. He did not think that would popularise the force in the country. Of course it was not the sole or chief inducement, but there was no doubt that the uniform influenced recruiting to some extent, and unless the right hon. Gentleman gave a uniform for show occasions, apart from the working suit, he would find a considerable falling off in the recruiting. It would be a matter of great regret if the Territorial Army were to be deprived of the services of adjutants from the Regular Army. It would be better to dispense with some of the higher officers from the Regular Forces, proposed to be given to the Territorial Army, in order to have a more complete Regular staff, and in order to maintain the adjutants from the Regulars. To obtain the extra money for the Territorial Force he suggested that the numbers of the Regular Army should be reduced. It had been said again and again that the expeditionary force was much larger than had ever been previously contemplated. Without trenching greatly on the Cardwellian principle, he thought they could do without a certain number of the battalions of the Regular Army. He did not suggest for a moment that the battalions should be disbanded at once, or until the new Territorial Army was organised. After all, they could get so much more out of the Auxiliary Forces in point of numbers for the money spent on them than they could get from the Regular forces. The cost of a regular soldier was from £80 to £90 per year, while the figures for the Auxiliary Forces were much less than that. He thought that the Regular Army was composed of very good material, but if they were to have a strong popular force at home, they must find the money for it. He knew that there was a feeling that the system suggested for obtaining officers for the Home Army was not sufficiently democratic; but he thought that that impression could, without great difficulty, be removed. It would depend to a certain extent upon the composition and power of the county associations. At present we were largely dependent upon the public schools and the Universities for the kind of men wanted as officers. And that was because young fellows got from these institutions the kind of education on which it was easy to shape them into good officers, in a fairly short time. It was for that reason that he wished to extend greater opportunities for secondary education to all classes, so that we might be able to get the best kind of officer from every class. As to the composition of the county associations, he certainly thought that the Bill as drafted did not make them sufficiently democratic. If the Territorial Army was to become a living force, its fate must be given more into its own hand. He did not like to see such a preponderance of the representation of the Regular forces in the management of the Territorial Army. He was much afraid that the military advisers of the right hon. Gentleman, who had in their hearts a great desire for conscription, hoped that his scheme would fail. He hoped that without Party spirit they would in Committee make the scheme of the Secretary for War such a success as would prevent all possible idea of conscription being imposed on the country.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said that almost all the speeches made by Members on the Ministerial Benches contained one most important criticism, and that was that a sufficiently strong Territorial Army could not be created for the sum of money which the Secretary of State intended to spend. If that was the case, or if this scheme was not going to effect an economy, then the Government must re-consider their position. He was one of those who, like right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, had tried to make himself acquainted with the provisions of the Bill, but the more he studied it the more complicated the scheme seemed to be. In fact, the whole Bill was as vague and nebulous as it was possible for a Bill to be. In his speeches the Secretary for War had made a great appeal to country gentlemen and employers of labour to form county associations in order to raise men for the Territorial Army. That was returning to the system in vogue in the feudal ages, to which he was opposed, and he was afraid that the scheme would probably provide us with a Territorial Army whose manoeuvres would be more fit for the Middle Ages than for modern warfare. In order to consider this matter in all respects, they must first of all take stock of what the right hon. Gentlemen was going to destroy. It was useless for hon. Members on the Ministerial Benches to say they did not believe that the Bill was going to destroy the Militia. As he understood the Bill, by it our present Auxiliary Forces would be destroyed or altogether changed in character. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Chippenham that it was all to the good to get men into the Army Reserve. They were the best and cheapest soldiers that could be obtained. He was certain that it was greatly owing to the splendid patriotism and excellent services of the Reservists that the South African War was brought to a successful conclusion. Under this scheme we should not get Reservists equal to the men we were losing. The Secretary for War ought, in his opinion, to have retained the extra battalion of the Guards, by which men could be passed quickly into the Reserve. The new special service troops could not receive training equal to that of men who had served three years with the Regulars under the strictest discipline and the most highly trained officers the country could produce. As to the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, the Bill abolished the whole principles upon which those forces had been maintained and regarded in the past. He was free to admit, however, that there was a great difference of military opinion upon the subject. Leading generals frequently, when they made speeches at dinners, prize-givings and public functions, said that the Yeomanry, the Militia, and our Auxiliary Forces generally, were very fine fellows and most valuable to the country and the service, and he believed that one of our chief Generals on his return from South Africa made a speech in which he said that the C.I.V.'s were the best troops that he had ever had under his command. When, however, these distinguished Generals sat upon Commissions those Commissions made reports absolutely contradictory to that, declaring that the Auxiliary Forces were absolutely inefficient and unable to stand up against the first line of Continental troops. But nobody in this country could suppose that we should have men in the second-line Army, who, at the outbreak of war, would be able to take their place against the first line of foreign Powers. He believed that Germany and France did not expect that, and that in those countries it was not the case that such troops existed. To his mind, therefore, it was absolutely begging the question to reason in that manner, and to throw the whole of the Auxiliary Forces as they were at present into the melting pot in order to obtain something of which they knew nothing. It was a very great mistake, in his judgment, to do that, because, forsooth, certain military authorities thought the Auxiliary Forces were not fit to meet the first line of Continental armies in the field. Military opinion appeared to be much divided on the subject. Certainly under the present system excellent troops were raised and maintained. What was the Territorial Army which was to take their place? From beginning to end of the Bill there was nothing to show that it would be an efficient force to take the field. Everything was left to future schemes and directions which were yet to be drawn up. The only thing they had at present was the statement of the Secretary for War that he wanted 300,000 men, for whom he was going to pay £2,800,000. Our present Auxiliary Forces numbered between 300,000 and 400,000 men, and cost £4,500,000. How did the right hon. Gentleman expect to get a more efficient fighting force for the second line when he cut down the expenses in that way? The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have in his mind the feudal system, and probably he realised that the money voted by Parliament would be entirely insufficient, and expected that as soon as the county associations were formed the hat would be sent round for voluntary subscriptions for pay and equipment. Indeed, as much was hinted at in Clause 3, under which the associations were enabled to make use of money which came to them from other sources than Parliament. In order that this scheme should succeed he believed there must be a very large demand for subscriptions from people in the counties where the territorial forces were set up. As to the efficiency of the Territorial Army, he was one of those who believed that no force, whether it was the first line or the second line of auxiliaries, would be of the least value, or at all events would be of very low value, unless it was properly disciplined. He did not refer merely to men obeying readily and willingly their officers on all occasions; there was something more important than that, and it was the officers obeying the commands of their superior officers in no carping spirit. One of the greatest difficulties that officers had to contend with was the maintenance of discipline, and if anyone thoroughly conversant with the Army inquired into the matter they would find that those battalions which did the best service in the war in South Africa and in every other war were those in which the highest state of discipline had been maintained, and where both the officers and men had been accustomed to obey without quibbling. That was true with regard to the Guards, the Regulars and the Auxiliary Forces. It was absolutely essential that there should be discipline in the ranks and among the officers. He turned to the Bill to see if this Territorial Force would be efficient. As regarded that he was pleased to see at the outset some words to the effect that the Bill dealt with the government, discipline, and pay of the Army, but if they read the Bill they would find that there was nothing about pay in it, except that the soldiers were to be paid as much as the Secretary of State for War issued orders for, and although the right hon. Gentleman had given them a memorandum, there was nothing in the Bill which said that any man was to receive any pay at all—they were all dependent upon the good will and liberality of the Secretary of State for War. In regard to discipline it was exactly the same. The Bill simply said that orders on the subject were to be issued by the Secretary of State. The only definite statement was that if a man were disobedient he was to be discharged. In fact, so great were the difficulties thrown in the way of a man's leaving the force, if he so desired, that the simplest thing for him to do seemed to be to disobey his commanding officer. He did not think the Bill would satisfy anybody who wished that the scheme should be a reality and not a sham, nor did he think the condition of these forces could be satisfactory. He knew the difficulty about the Auxiliary Forces and had always thought that this country would never have a proper service until it was provided that if a man took upon himself the burden of defending his country he should have certain advantages and privileges over his fellow citizens, say in the way of voting, increased pay, exemption from taxation, or qualification for old-age pensions. The inducements held out by the Secretary for War, however, would not have much power to keep men in the forces. So far as he could make out, the only advantage that was offered to induce a man to join the force was that if he were a Member of Parliament he need not vacate his seat, and if he were an elector he would not be disfranchised. The only thing provided was that the members of the Territorial Force were not to suffer disadvantage in those ways. There was not sufficient provision made as regarded pay and discipline, and the whole of the provisions in regard to those matters were very indefinite. Thinking that he himself might join the Territorial Force he read the Bill to see if he could find something definite as to what he might make himself liable to, but he found the provisions as to that also very indefinite. They must not, moreover, be always content to take it that what was said by Ministers and others in their speeches was embodied in their Bill. He remembered that some time ago, in 1901, he thought, when the Yeomanry was being reorganised, Mr. Brodrick stated in the House that he was most anxious in reorganising the Yeomanry to provide every facility for Volunteers who could ride to join the Yeomanry and become Yeomanry and Volunteers. He heard the right hon. Gentleman make that statement, and acting upon it he went down to his constituency and proceeded to enlist some ten or twenty Volunteers in the Yeomanry. A short time afterwards he had an indignant letter from the Colonel of the Volunteer regiment complaining that certain people were walking about the town sometimes in Volunteer uniform and sometimes in Yeomanry uniform. He got very frightened and thought that perhaps he had rendered himself liable to be Court-martialled and to have heavy penalties inflicted on him. He consulted a friend on the question, and he was then told that he need not bother himself as the Government would be only too glad to get a man to count twice over, once on the Volunteer establishment and again on the Yeomanry establishment. When they came to the actual formation of the new territorial force they had to consider what the Bill set forth and what training the men were to receive. The question of the terms of service and the question of training were left in the most vague position. Everything was "as may be prescribed." The annual training might be eight, fifteen, or thirty days, or might be dispensed with altogether. The only thing certain was that a man who, having joined the territorial force, failed to appear when the force was embodied for six months training in time of war, would be treated as a deserter. There was no penalty stated; but the penalty for desertion in face of the enemy was shooting. It therefore came to this, that the right hon. Gentleman was asking the country to throw away the present Auxiliary Forces and in their place to accept a scheme in which there was nothing certain with regard to discipline, or pay, or terms of service, or preliminary drill, or annual training. If any man when he had enlisted in the territorial force could make out under what conditions he was serving he would be a perfect wonder. Yet one of the provisions was that every person authorised to enlist recruits was to state to the recruit the terms of the contract to be entered into. How on earth could a recruiting officer comply with such a requirement? The officer or sergeant who, wishing to secure a recruit, could inform the man of the conditions of service would be clever indeed. If the scheme should be successful, if the War Office found a large number of men forthcoming, then after the men were enlisted fresh orders would be issued, the screw would be put in motion, and the training would be lengthened. If, on the other hand, the men were not obtained—as he believed they would not be—then the screw would be relaxed, there would be Orders in Council, orders from the Secretary of State, from the Army Council, and from the associations, reducing the number of drills, and the 300,000 men would perhaps be obtained, but they would not be properly trained. The man who joined the Army would be in the position of a man playing a game in which his adversary made the rules as they went along. Military authorities should declare the minimum of training required and the men should be enlisted on that understanding, but this scheme was simply a means by which the screw could be tightened or relaxed as it might suit political exigencies and influence elections.

*COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) said he had not the opportunity of listening to the earlier portion of the speech of the noble Lord, but he came in in time to hear his excellent remarks upon discipline. He, as an old soldier, agreed with every word the noble Lord had said on that point. The noble Lord's anxiety as to the amount of training required could not be relieved by laying down a hard and fast rule, for degrees of capacity varied, and he would be sorry to say how long it would take the noble Lord or any Member of the House to become proficient in the "goose" step or any other part of the military art. The rules must be left elastic, and the power given in this Bill should be left in the hands of the military authority to prolong or curtail the time of instruction as circumstances required. To hon. and right hon. Members opposite they were in the habit of looking for Imperial views on many subjects, and he asked them to take a broader view, and see if there was not an Imperial side to the questions raised by the Bill. Outside these islands were our great dependencies, as was pointed out by the right hon. Member for Dover, who alone of those whom he had heard speak from the other side touched a little on the Imperial side of the question. The right hon. Member had reminded the House of the great English-speaking communities over seas, but even the right hon. Gentleman failed to realise that in this Bill our military organisation was being brought nearer to that existing in other parts of the Empire than it had been brought by any previous measure. He had had personal knowledge for many years of the local Forces in one of our principal Colonies, and he would refer to that experience as bearing on this measure. The Government had been represented as being desirous of abolishing the Militia by the Bill now before the House. But so far from abolishing the Militia, they were restoring its true spirit. They were going back, not to feudalism as had been suggested, but to the principles which once underlay the Militia system in this country and which still underlay the Militia system in our Colonies. There the dread of militarism was so strong that they would not have any troops except those raised on a Militia basis under a law precisely similar to that now proposed by this Bill. In Canada, the Colony to which he had particularly referred, they had one Act under which all the forces of the Colony were raised

—the Militia Act. Under that Act there were troops who served under precisely the same conditions as our Regulars, but the jealousy of the Militia principle was so strong that the Parliament insisted that those troops should be raised under and be subject to the Militia Act. The difference between those troops and others was that they were called up for continuous training whilst the others were only called upon for periodical training. The elasticity provided in this Bill was necessary to curtail or prolong the period during which the services of the troops might be required for the benefit of the country. The hon. Member for the Central Division of Sheffield had criticised the measure because it placed the whole of the Auxiliary Forces under one Act; and the mover of the Amendment had said it was impossible to unite under one system all the Auxiliary Forces unless we had compulsion. That difficulty had been got over in Canada. There were there different classes of the community who could not all perform service under the same conditions; and the Act under which they served had been modified by regulations so as to allow each class of the community to perform their training in the way best suited to their ordinary avocations. It permitted such training as our Volunteers received and the more continuous training given to the Militia in camps and barracks. It went further and permittted continuous training such as the Regulars received. That disposed of the purely imaginary difficulty and fear that, if all the Auxiliary Forces were placed under one Act and formed into a homogeneous Territorial Force, the Force would be weakened because it would be impossible to employ all the different classes of the community. Exception had been taken to the proposal to place all troops raised for the Territorial Army entirely on their own basis and not to furnish them with a permanent staff. When he took over the command of the Militia troops in Canada, though he found that many of his predecessors had urged and pressed for the adoption of the English principle of a permanent staff, he received the impression that it was going against the feeling of the people to introduce into the Canadian system that permanent element. He, therefore, took the view that every unit should maintain itself in every particular—that its own officers and non-commissioned officers should be its instructors and he believed the results justified that view. It was only in that way that the *esprit de corps* or rather the *esprit de regiment* which was necessary to produce good units could be obtained. Given that spirit and suitable arrangements, such as schools, for training instructors, he had no fear for the result. He did not wish to labour the point. His only object in intervening was to show that they were not trying a new experiment in this Bill. It was not a speculative measure, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had said, for a similar system existed in Switzerland, and with admirable results, though under a compulsory system. Such a system might exist with equal success without compulsion. He believed more in democratic enthusiasm than in bureaucratic compulsion. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon agreed that the Militia had fallen on evil days, but while agreeing with the diagnosis of the Secretary of State, he seemed to object to the application of any form of remedy. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman's earnest zeal for the Army, which he had shown both in office and out of office, would lead him to help in making this a measure which might once more set up that fine old Force on which they all looked with pride, the old Militia Force.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): It is only too evident from the empty state of the House that great national questions involving the gravest issues are under consideration. But we are used to this on Army debates, and I hope that on this occasion the smallness of the attendance is not entirely due to the fact that I am now addressing the House. I think the Secretary for War will admit that, whatever may be the fate of this Bill in this House, the system which it proposes to set up cannot possibly come into practical being unless it receives not only the assent but the enthusiastic support of the majority of the people of this country; and, therefore, I think that it is reasonable for us to inquire what measure of support it has received so far. I think the right hon. Gentleman will be the first to admit that hitherto, at any rate, there has been a remarkable restraint of criticism, that there has been a patriotic desire exhibited to examine his proposals in an unbiassed and non-party, I might almost say in an indulgent, spirit; and I think that arises from the fact that it is recognised that he is making a serious attempt to solve the most baffling military problem that confronts a Minister of War in any country, and he is given full credit for that. But I am afraid, as far as we on this side of the House are concerned, that is as far as our approbation can go. We recognise, of course, the goodness of the right hon. Gentleman's intentions; we know that the War Office is paved with good intentions, but we feel that the scheme, however sound it may be in theory, is in many of its most vital aspects unworkable in practice. It seems to be based on a series of hypotheses which do not take into account the workings of human nature or the passive resisting power of vested interests, and, in short, whilst he has produced a scheme which is homogeneous, which is complete and even imposing on paper, in my opinion it can never be materialised and carried out in anything like the form in which he has presented it, because the officers and men will not be forthcoming. The Amendment of my right hon. friend states in very forcible terms the process of cleaning the slate on which the right hon. Gentleman is resolved. The Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, at any rate in their present form, will be practically wiped out; and whilst the right hon. Gentleman has written on the slate a very attractive scheme for reconstituting or replacing them, it all depends upon whether the existing Forces are willing to fall in with his views. I do not mean that there is any fear that they would oppose his scheme from mere "cussedness," but they may find it impossible to accept his proposals, because in their opinion they may run counter to all their interests and make their continued existence impossible. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Berwick Division said that the opposition to this scheme was really a Militia opposition. I am sorry that he spoke in a tone of such undisguised hostility towards the Militia. But, after all, the chief merit of the new scheme is that it undoubtedly introduces a uniform and homogeneous system, but that is attained at very heavy cost, particularly to the Militia and the Yeomanry, from whom, no doubt, the greater part of the opposition is likely to proceed; and it is to be carried out at what I believe to be a fatal cost, because in order to get your uniformity, you are going to level down the Auxiliary Forces to the standard of the lowest instead of levelling them up. After all, even if this opposition does come from the Militia and the Yeomanry, they are being called upon to make very grave sacrifices. These are summarised perhaps as well as they can be by the military correspondent of *The Times*, who wrote the other day that—

> "The Militia loses its cherished indentity as a separate Force and is asked to give up its substance and become a new Reserve to the Regular Army. The Yeomanry are asked to revert from a high rate of pay to the standard of the cavalry of the line. We may get yeomen of a kind at the rates proposed, but it is not certain that it will be the same fine Force that it was."

I am afraid that the right hon. Gentleman will find that, as time goes on, this foreboding will be only too well justified. The Volunteers are doubtless less upset by the scheme than either of the two other portions of the Auxiliary Forces; their traditions are more preserved, and by this means, no doubt, the edge of their opposition will be considerably blunted. But has the right hon. Gentleman any assurance that his proposals will be accepted by the bulk of the Volunteer Forces; because unless his proposal is accepted, not merely with assent but with enthusiasm, the scheme is bound to die from lack of driving power. I feel sure that he recognises that. Has he received that assurance with regard to the practicability and popularity of the county associations? We have heard one Volunteer officer behind him, the hon. Member for East Edinburgh, and I think that it is evident that he is strongly opposed to the county associations. I have endeavoured during the recess to ascertain the opinions of a number of prominent Volunteer officers with regard to this question. I found that they all had an anxious desire, in a soldier-like spirit, to assist the right hon. Gentleman as far as they possibly could, but at the same time they pointed out grave defects in his scheme, particularly as to the proposed county associations, which, in their opinion, are given a far too ambitious and extended list of duties. A great many of them are in favour of modified county associations, with comparatively minor duties; but with the list of duties as now proposed they consider there will be over centralisation, that it will lead to work being done at the headquarters of the associations which could be done much better at the headquarters of the units, and that the chief result will be friction, followed by a great deal of extra work, and, as is inevitable in all these cases, a great deal of extra cost. Coming to a smaller matter, that is the abolition of the Regular adjutants, I find that proposal is universally condemned. I do not think in the debate to-day that there has been hardly a single opinion in favour of it. It seems to me that this step can only be defended on the principle of saving money at any cost, and surely it is a notable example of spoiling the ship for a halfpennyworth of tar. Of course I have heard with great respect the opinion expressed by the hon. and gallant Member for South Monmouthshire, whose experience with the Canadian Militia is very great. I had the honour of serving with him when he was in Canada, and he knows that any opinion which he could express would be received by me with great respect. But I cannot altogether allow his opinion to weigh against that of the bulk of Volunteer officers in this country, who have had practical experience of the work of their own corps, in which the conditions are not precisely the same as those which obtain in the Canadian Militia. I also find, unfortunately for the scheme, a consensus of opinion among the Volunteer officers whom I have consulted, that the terms of service as set forth in the Bill—and I cannot but believe that they are made unnecessarily forbidding in the wording of the Bill—will cause a number of good men to resign and discourage fresh men from joining. The discouragements are first of all the penalties, which, I gather from the right hon. Gentleman, he does not propose to enforce. If he does not propose to enforce them, why does he put them in the Bill? He says they may be wanted.

MR. HALDANE said the penalties were similar to those contained in the Volunteer Corps Rules at the present time. The Government had only substituted new machinery.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: I think that the right hon. Gentleman has made the penalties very much more formidable than they were; at any rate, they are so regarded by Volunteers, and after all the important thing is that if they think so it is going to discourage enlistment. The other thing which I am told will discourage enlistment is the obligation to be liable to six months embodiment in the case of emergency. The War Office is no doubt counting upon the patriotism of employers to secure men in their jobs if they are called out in this way. I hope the War Office will be justified in their hope. But will they set a practical example? Is the Government prepared to guarantee that any men who are in the Government service and who are called out for six months under this Bill, will have their full pay, or at any rate that the difference between their full pay in their employment and their pay received as Volunteers, shall be secured to them, or their families, and their places kept open for them? That would be a practical test of the Government's patriotism in this matter, and I will at any rate give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of expressing an opinion on that subject by moving an Amendment later on in the Committee Stage of the Bill. Personally I cannot help thinking that this obligation which is to be kept hanging over the heads of the men who may be in steady employment, will be an even greater discouragement to recruiting than would be the same period of training at the beginning of the term of enlistment, because after all there are always a certain number of men, particularly young men, who may be out of a job at the time, or who are willing to wait for a job until they have completed a definite period of training. They would begin the training at once and thus know what they were in for, and the experience they would gain during that long preliminary period might well be kept up by that short period of annual training which the right hon. Gentleman proposes in his Bill. At any rate while by such a process you might get a less number of men, yet you would get a far higher rate of efficiency, and, when an emergency arose, you could always fill up with a similar class of recruits to those that you expect to get under the existing terms of enlistment. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division gave us some interesting information with regard to the Swiss army. He pointed out with great force that one of the secrets of success of the Swiss system was that the longer period of training—six weeks—comes at the commencement instead of being held over until an emergency arises. I do ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it would not be better to have the longer period at the commencement rather than to hold over the head of the recruit that it will only be enforced when war has broken out. I must refer for a moment to a recent speech by General Sir John French, in which he is reported to have said that—

> "The new scheme is based on the principle that it is the bounden duty of every young man to take part in his country's defence."

If he is correctly reported, I can only surmise that the right hon. Gentleman's speech in explanation of, and his printed memorandum on, this Bill must have been singularly misunderstood by the gallant and distinguished soldier, because surely, nothing can be further from the facts. As a matter of fact, by the Bill the vast majority of able bodied young men are encouraged to evade this duty, whilst the few who do voluntarily consent to qualify, in a *dilettante* sort of way, are threatened with pains and penalties if, subsequently, they happen to change their minds. One would have imagined from General Sir John French's speech as reported, that the Militia Ballot Act is being brought into force, and that, in that way, an old obligation which has long since fallen into desuetude, is being revived by the right hon. Gentleman. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman, on this point, whether he proposes that the Militia Ballot Act should now lapse altogether, or whether he proposes to keep it in existence?

MR. HALDANE: This Bill does not touch the Militia Ballot Act, but, even if it were brought into force, it would be found to be unworkable. Further than that, it allows paid substitution, which, I think, is a most vicious principle.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: We all admit that the Act is not what it should be, but it is all we have got, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not allow it to lapse.

MR. HALDANE: It will not lapse.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: In studying this Territorial Army, I could not help being reminded of a remark of Lord North's when the list of officers who were to serve in an approaching campaign was submitted to him. He said—

> "I do not know what effect these names will have on the enemy, but I know they make me tremble."

I think I might apply that remark to the right hon. Gentleman's Territorial Army. I do not wish to be accused of undue levity, but I should venture to describe it as a "Snodgrass Army"—and I hope the right hon. Gentleman and the Government generally are better acquainted with their "Pickwick" than they were with the Scriptures in the earlier part of the debate. I think the right hon. Gentleman will remember that on the only occasion on which Mr. Snodgrass was called upon to fight, it was related that—

> "In a truly Christian spirit, and in order that he might take no one unawares, he announced in a very loud tone that he was going to begin, and proceeded to take off his coat with the utmost deliberation."

What was the result? In the next sentence I find—

> "He was immediately surrounded and secured,"

and, as he was led away captive—

> "Listened with gloomy respect to the torrents of eloquence which his leader poured forth."

I do not see, seriously, how any one can possibly defend the theory of causing an army to commence its training after hostilities have actually begun, and which proceeds on the assumption that there will be a "close time" for a force of this kind in modern war. We have heard a great deal in the course of the debate about another grievous defect in the right hon. Gentleman's Territorial Army, and that is with regard to the artillery question. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division said that the advantage of the new scheme was that it gave "cohesion and artillery" to the second line. I have endeavoured to show that it does not give cohesion, and

I think I can show that it cannot possibly give efficiency to the artillery. *The Times* correspondent has described the artillery problem as being the greatest of the unsolved problems in connection with the Territorial Army. But the new scheme does not solve the artillery problem. It merely aggravates it, and when this matter was discussed on a previous occasion the right hon. Gentleman, if I may say so, showed a curious testiness and irritability with regard to criticisms of the artillery. He recognised no doubt that it was a fatal weakness, and he did not like attention being called to it. At any rate, he derided the long experience of artillery experts, and dismissed their opinions with the taunt that there was "more superstition about artillery than about any other subject except theology." If he were in a position where he was exposed to rapid bursts of shrapnel, while he was endeavouring to adjust a fuse or a telescopic sight, he would find that there was considerable cogency in the superstition. Speaking to his constituents, only in September last, the right hon. Gentleman said "We need more Artillery, and nothing short of the best will do." But he is about to reduce the best and to create for the second line of the Army an artillery which is bound to be the worst in Europe. [Cries of "Why?"] Because it will be untrained and armed with inferior weapons. It will be unfit to go into action against the only enemy which it can possibly be called upon to fight. But perhaps the right hon. Gentleman's real excuse was disclosed in the reply which he made to an interruption of mine, during the previous debate. The right hon. Gentleman then said that he—

> "Hoped the contingency would not arise of this Territorial Artillery having to fight at all."

And of course if they are not intended for purposes of war it does not matter how they are trained or armed. In spite of what the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division said, I contend that the training to be given to this force will be hopelessly and ludicrously inadequate. The right hon. Gentleman bases his hopes on the experience of the Lancashire Militia Field Artillery. But that comparison is altogether inadequate and misleading. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman read a recent debate in the United Service Institution, in which most of the officers of the Lancashire Field Artillery took part. Colonel Wing, who commands that force, described his three batteries. He pointed out that they had a permanent staff of 120 Regulars, or one Regular to every two Militiamen; that half of the non-commissioned officers and most of the specialists were Regulars; that the recruits began with twenty-eight days training on enlistment, and that was followed by eight weeks continuous training every summer for the batteries, and an extra month for non-commissioned officers and specialists. Further, he pointed out that though the Lancashire Field Artillery did extremely well in the circumstances, they were only placed as third class at the inspection on Salisbury Plain. Compare with this the fact that the new Territorial Artillery would only have from eight to fifteen days training annually. There would be only fourteen to eighteen Regulars per battery, and there would be no Regular officers, or even Regular adjutants. Colonel Wing added—

> "If a large increase of Militia Field Artillery is to be made, you cannot get such a high standard of officer as in the Lancashire Field Artillery; in fact, I am sure you cannot get them."

Colonel Wing also pointed out the great difficulty there would be about non-commissioned officers. These remarks were fully endorsed by Lieutenant-Colonel Campbell-Hyslop of the Lancashire Militia Field Artillery, who said that the Regular nucleus of their batteries was the secret of their success, and he compared it to a nucleus crew of a battleship which trains throughout the year and "keeps the whole show in order." Colonel F. G. Stone, late Inspector-General of Canadian Field Artillery said—

> "No country can produce many officers of that kind, nor can it be expected that there are many of these special officers or non-commissioned officers to go round."

Colonel Stone further said that—

> "A Militia non-commissioned officer can never exercise the same authority as a Regular non-commissioned officer, because if he did he would be liable to retaliation when the training was over.'

Then the debate was summed up by one of the greatest living authorities upon artillery training, Major-General Sir George Marshall, who pointed out that—

> "The experiment with the Lancashire Field Artillery has been a small one, and I do not believe in small experiments proving anything in a large way. . . . I do not see how we are going to have a Militia Field Artillery fit to go into action and to fight Regulars unless they are as good as the enemy. . . . In my opinion the introduction of quick-firing guns will necessitate that the commissioned officers of batteries shall be men of the highest capacity and training—men who have been trained all their lives to it."

But perhaps the unkindest blow of all given to the right hon. Gentleman came from his *Fidus Achates*, *The Times* military correspondent, who summed up the controversy by declaring that—

> "If any politician believes that he is going to obtain officers fit to command modern quick-firing batteries from among people who do not give up their whole time to the study and practice of artillery, the first battle in which these persons are engaged would disabuse him of that belief."

He added—

> "Half-trained officers and half-trained men have no business to touch these guns. They will not get half the results attained by the trained hands; they will get no useful result at all."

These are the opinions of the best qualified experts, and I do not think that the right hon Gentleman will be able to dismiss them as artillery superstitions. Then I wish to touch on the question of the *matériel* of the batteries—that is to say, the guns with which they are to be armed. I base my criticism from experience in the field. It has been conclusively proved to be a disastrous policy to attempt to arm half-trained troops with an inferior weapon, for unless these troops are given at least as good a weapon as that possessed by their adversaries, they will be hopelessly demoralised before going into action at all. The right hon. Gentleman has endeavoured to create the impression that the converted 15-pounder gun with which he proposes to arm the Territorial Artillery will be as good as that with which they are likely to be faced. I put down a Question on the subject, and I am afraid by the form of the Question I may have afforded the right hon. Gentleman inviting opportunities of giving figures which really do not institute a true comparison between the converted 15-pounder and the guns of other nations. It may be the fault of my Question, but the figures given were very misleading. The right hon. Gentleman gave the range of the 15-pounder gun as being 5,900 yards, which he showed as being equal to, and in the case of the German gun, in excess of the range of the guns of other countries. He did not say, however, that that means that we happen to have a fuse which will burn a sufficient time to enable that range to be obtained, and that in order to get it the gun has to be elevated to an angle of twenty-five degrees, and the remaining velocity is so small and the angle of descent so great that the effect of the projectile will be practically nil. I really do not understand the right hon. Gentleman's figures with regard to the comparison with the German gun, which he showed to be very inferior to the French gun and even to this converted 15-pounder. But do his figures refer to the old German gun which I understand has now been discarded, or to the new German gun which is to be taken into use in the German Army? I think in making any comparison of any kind he ought to give the figures of the latest German gun, and I will put myself in order by putting down a Question on the subject. In conclusion, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will recognise that I am not pressing this artillery question in any captious spirit. It is a subject which has interested me most of my life, and I hope that he will examine into it further, and that on further examination he will admit that he has not given sufficient consideration either to the *personnel* or to the *matériel* of this force. I think he may carry his passion for uniformity too far, and in my opinion the only safe plan as regards the artillery is to increase the Regular artillery to a sufficient extent to enable it to serve the needs both of the field force and of the Territorial Army. If, from financial considerations, the right hon. Gentleman is unable to do that, I beg that he will accept the standard of the Lancashire Field Artillery as an irreducible minimum. If he refuses to do that, and persists in imagining he can equip an effective artillery force on the conditions laid down in the Bill, then I believe, and I understand it is the opinion of all artillery experts, he will be merely conniving at a murderous and extremely costly farce.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The remark with which the hon. Gentleman has just concluded his speech points to this conclusion, that if we are desirous of attaining a high standard of efficiency with regard to artillery, it is quite impossible to include artillery in any Volunteer force or any force such as is in contemplation by this Bill.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: My last appeal to the right hon. Gentleman was that he will accept the standard of the Lancashire Field Artillery, which is part of the auxiliary forces, as the irreducible minimum.

*MR. BUCHANAN: Yes, but the hon. and gallant Member had said that it would be impossible if we wanted to attain a high standard of efficiency in regard to the artillery to include artillery with the arms of the force which we are creating. Of course I quite sympathise with the hon. and gallant Gentleman, who, being an artillery officer himself, naturally looks at the interests of the artillery first, in discussing this scheme. ["Oh."] I do not mean that in any offensive sense. It is desirable that those addressing the House should address it upon the particular points with which they are best acquainted. What I was going to say was that I have listened throughout the evening to the various speeches which have been made in the progress of this debate, and I think I am within the mark in saying that on the whole they have not been directed against the principle of this Bill or against its substance, but they have been mainly criticisms with regard to certain points of detail in the Bill, and they have largely been criticisms of certain points and proposals which are not in the Bill, and are not proposed by my right hon. friend, but which will properly come up for our consideration when we come to deal with the Bill in its further stages. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover in the speech which he delivered in the early part of the debate, attacked the Bill on definite lines, and he concluded his speech by moving an Amendment which, of course, if carried, would prove fatal to the Bill; but I do not think that even he is wholly hostile to the Bill, and I do not gather that he would look upon the passing of the Bill as a great calamity. I do not think that in any of the subsequent speeches from that side of the House, and certainly not from this, has there been any definite, downright fully considered hostility to the Bill. Therefore, I think my right hon. friend and the Government are justified in considering that upon the whole the debate has been favourable to the proposals before the House, and that we may look forward to the passage of the Bill through Parliament, no doubt with Amendments, and we may hope with some confidence to arrive at a satisfactory solution of this difficult Army problem that has vexed and puzzled so many minds for years past. I say with Amendments, because the Government are fully open to the value of the various criticisms that have been directed to the Bill. The clauses of the Bill are by no means intended to be an ultimatum as to what the Government have got to propose; it is rather a Bill which confers powers within which the Secretary of State and the Army Council may be able to operate. With regard to Amendments on any of the details we hold an open mind, and we shall be perfectly ready to receive suggestions favourably from all quarters of the House. To-night, therefore, I hope it will not be thought discourteous if I do not proceed to reply in detail to the many and various points that have been raised in discussion during the last three or four hours. I would rather bring the House back to the main principle of the Bill and main object that we have in view. My hon. and gallant friend the Member for Sheffield, who is not in his place, invited me to speak on this Bill. I have often in former days spoken upon questions connected with Army finance, but I never posed as being able to speak on military matters connected with the Army. I desire to speak purely as a civilian, and do not pretend to be even an amateur strategist. This Bill, as I have seen it, deals almost exclusively with the non-Regular Forces of the Crown, and with that body which was described as the second line of defence. What is the problem put before us connected with the second line of defence? We have at present ample material ready to our hands, but its organisation is not an organisation of a second line as a whole, but only of units and certain parts of it. In the same way, its training as it exists at this moment is not a scientific or systematic training. Surely, if that is the condition of the problem it is the duty of the Government to take advantage of this most efficient material and to endeavour to give it unity of organisation and unity of efficient training. The Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers are ample in numbers and keen in military spirit. They do not want merely to play at soldiers, but they want to be soldiers and to get the best possible military training within the limits of their remaining civilians, and under the conditions in which it is possible for them to serve. Surely we ought to embrace this opportunity and make their organisation one for the whole of the forces of the second line and give them a systematic training and render them as efficient as possible without making them cease to be civilians. It is no use to endeavour to alter and improve the condition of the Militia in one point, the Yeomanry in another, and the Volunteers in a third. My right hon. friend rightly goes a step further and asks the House and the country to take advantage of this opportunity to give the united forces of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers such training as will make them an efficient defensive force in time of national emergency. Of course, whether we shall succeed or not, or whether the Bill will pass in its present form, remains to be seen. The Government are open, as I have said, to suggestions for the improvement of the scheme so long as they are consistent with the main object they have in view. The fact that this is the object we have in view is recognised, at any rate, outside this House. It has been brought before the country mainly through the energy of my right hon. friend, and I believe the country now understands what the object is and approves of it, and the people are willing to support the Secretary for War in his arduous task as long as they are convinced that he is taking practical means to achieve his object. We have been told in the course of the debate that we are destroying the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers. That is not so; we are endeavouring to treat these three forces as a single body, and of course, if we amalgamate them into a single body they will, to a certain degree, lose their distinctive characteristics. But the efficiency of the whole body will be vastly improved. It has been asked on both sides of the House what relation does this proposal bear to proposals for conscription or compulsory service. There is no element of conscription or compulsory service in our proposals or behind our proposals; our scheme is founded on a voluntary basis. My right hon. friend has rightly said more than once that a volunteer is a volunteer. It is a useful truism to insist upon, that that is the basis on which we found this new departure and new development of our Army system. But there are certain individuals who criticise the scheme more or less favourably, but always with certain reservations. They say they wish well to the ingenious proposals my right hon. friend has placed before the country, and that he may perhaps succeed, but they end by saying that the scheme is foredoomed to failure because it is based on a voluntary system and not on the principle of compulsory service. There is no foundation for the suggestion that the ultimate motive of those who lay these proposals before the House is compulsory service. My right hon. friend over and over again has expressed his wholehearted allegiance to the voluntary principle as the basis of this proposal. It was mentioned, I think by the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division, that it was manifest on the face of it that a system of conscription was one which in many respects would be wholly unsuitable for adoption in this country. The British citizen is a patriotic man, and he is not blind to the interests of national defence or unwilling to undertake his full share of responsibility with regard to it; still he thinks, and he rightly thinks, that the burdens that are put upon his shoulders should be proportioned to his needs and to his risks, and that he should not have imposed upon him burdens which are wholly unnecessary. I do not know that after the speech of my hon. and gallant friend that I need elaborate this point. We have no land frontier like continental countries, and, therefore, our naval line of defence is our first line of defence, on which it is necessary and right for us to bestow our supreme attention. But, more than that, we have military obligations upon us connected with our Empire which render it practically impossible for us to adopt anything like general compulsory service. The first military necessity laid upon us is to see that we have a complete and sufficient force for garrisoning and defending India and our other Imperial possessions over the seas, and for that purpose it is absolutely essential that we should have a large force raised upon the Volunteer basis, and upon no other. That must be a prime necessity of any military organisation of this country, and having that large burden on our shoulders, it is absolutely impossible for us to adopt in addition a general compulsory system with regard to our home defence. This scheme is in no sense what it has been described—the last despairing effort on the part of the advocates of the voluntary system. It is a reasoned attempt to solve a difficult problem on broad lines, and I am certain that, if it fails it will but lead to another attempt on the same voluntary basis, and that the political leaders have not yet come into existence, or, at any rate, into prominence, who will be prepared to advocate anything like a general measure of compulsory service or conscription. I can understand that there may be doubt in certain quarters as to the cost of the scheme. But the Secretary for War has declared his confidence that he will be able to give the country a military force in the Territorial Army more efficient than and for less money than is now spent on the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers. With that statement I entirely agree. I think we have given an earnest of our endeavours to make that plain. We have taken the House into confidence and we have given an earnest of our economical intentions, knowing that it is expected by the House and by the vast majority of the country, so long as any reductions which may be effected can be made without sacrifice of efficiency. We believe that we have succeeded in doing that; and the same idea of economy actuates the proposals we are laying before the House with regard to the expenses of the Territorial Army. My right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean and other speakers have made certain comments on the Statement laid before the House by the Secretary of State a short time ago. We have made a complete Statement of what we believe will be, as far as we can estimate it, the general expenses of running this Territorial Army when it is in operation. There is really no secret in that. In the Memorandum of the Secretary of State there is a statement of the cost of running the Territorial Force when it comes into operation, and he is convinced of the accuracy of the Estimate. Of course there will be considerable expenditure incident to a great change of organisation such as is proposed, but this will be distributed over a certain period of time, and when the scheme comes into operation the cost will be less than that of the corresponding forces on the Estimates now. The figures are not final, and the Government will be ready to consider with an open mind in Committee any suggestions in relation to the third and other clauses of the Bill bearing on the subject. The general grounds upon which I urge the acceptance of the Second Reading of this Bill are, in the first place, that it proceeds upon a voluntary and not a compulsory basis. I think we have made that perfectly clear, and we intend absolutely to adhere to it. In the second place, it proceeds on what we believe to be a sound economical basis, because we are of the opinion that we shall spend less money upon the scheme and get a better return for our expenditure than we are getting now. In the third place, it provides an elastic and not a rigid system. We recognise the spirit in which the Auxiliary Forces have agreed to discharge their defence duties, and this imposes upon the Government the obligation to endeavour in our regulations to meet their needs and necessities, and with this object in view my right hon. friend has made the terms of his Bill elastic, so that it will be in the power of the Army Council to mould these regulations, and alter them according to the exigencies of the various corps and the characteristics of the various classes of citizens who join them, so that we may be able to take full advantage of the best material that is available in the country to develop this force. The Government are justified in noting with satisfaction the reception of the Bill. My right hon. friend has approached the problem with an open, a clear, and a vigorous mind, and has produced a practical scheme. If it continues to meet with the same consideration which it has received this evening, we may hope to pass into law an Act which will place on a secure foundation the defence of our country.

Motion made and Question "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Arnold-Forster,*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

SUPPLY [8th APRIL] REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

Class I.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £43,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Royal Palaces."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Osborne."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £50,700 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, and for the maintenance of certain Cemetries abroad."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £427,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office, and Post Office Telegragh Buildings in Great Britain, and certain Post Offices abroad, including Furniture, Fuel, and sundry Miscellaneous Services."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £313,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain, not provided for on other Votes."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £47,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £46,600, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray

the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of Miscellaneous Legal Buildings."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £91,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £32,400, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Houses of Parliament Buildings."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the execution and erection of a Monument in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury."

First Two Resolutions agreed to.

Third Resolution, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,700 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, and for the maintenance of certain Cemeteries abroad," read a second time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) asked the First Commissioner of Works to give some undertaking that the expenditure upon Embassies abroad would be more economical in the future than in the past. He would like some assurance that there would be more economy practised in regard to the erection of buildings in foreign countries.

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale) said he hoped the extravagances of the past would facilitate economies in the future.

Resolution agreed to.

Fourth to Seventh Resolutions agreed to.

Eighth Resolution, "That a sum, not exceeding £91,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens," read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he desired to impress upon the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of keeping the total cost of works undertaken by his office nearer the original Estimates.

MR. HARCOURT promised that the Estimates in the future would be made upon a closer basis.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Subsequent Resolutions to be considered to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 10*th April,* 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Barry Railway Bill (by Order); Taff Vale Railway Bill (by Order); Port Talbot Railway and Dock Bill (by Order); Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill. Reported, with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Aberbeeg; Abercarn; Abertillery (two); Alloa and Devon; Alva; Arrail Griffin; Blackhill (two); Bloxwich; Cadder; Camp; Caradog Vale; Celynen; Chapel New Mains; Clackmannan; Crown Lodge; Cwm; Cwmtillery; Diamond; Garswood; Guenoo; Halifax; Kendon Lodge; Llankilleth; Lletty Shenkin; Merthyr Vale; Miskin; Motherwell; Mount Avernon; Old Hills; Parkhead; Pelsall; Penyfan; Quarry Bank; Rose Heyworth; Shettleston; Tillery; Tillicoultry; Tollercross; Troedyrhiw; Twyn Gwyn; Vivian; and, West Longrigg Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Abroath and St. Vigeans, against; to lie upon the Table.

FEUS AND BUILDING LEASES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dalziel, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Battyhill; Dalziel; Glasgow (three); Inverness; Kilmacolm; Kirkintilloch; Melsetter; Motherwell; Saltcoats; and, Skelmorlie; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Bollington Holy Trinity; Kingston on Thames; and, Knowle (Bristol); to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA PUNJAB (INQUIRY INTO DEATHS FROM TETANUS.)

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 26th March; *Sir William Collins*]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES.)

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3755 to 3757 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Great Central Railway Bill, and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158b]; referred to the Committee on the Bill.

REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (GREAT BRITAIN.)

Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools for 1906. Part I. List of Schools and Detailed Reports [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF ESSEX.)

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Essex dividing the Bowers Gifford Polling District in the Mid-Essex Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS (IRELAND.)

Return ordered, "of the Government Institutions, Military, Police, Prisons, &c., in Ireland, giving particulars of the supplies annually procured; whether or not the contracts for the same are advertised in Ireland and are open to general competition, and the addresses of the officials who control these contracts."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.

Return ordered, "of the Amounts of British Government Securities held by the several Government Departments and other Public Offices on the 31st day of March, 1907, specifying whether held in England or Ireland (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 163, of Session 1906) :—

£2½ per Cent. Consols.	£2¾ per Cents. (1905).	£2½ per Cents.	£2¾ per Cent. War Loan.	Other Securities.	
				Annuities for terms of years.	Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills.

—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

Address for "Return of the net Income and Expenditure of British India under certain specified heads for the 11 years from 1895–6 to 1905–6 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 116, of Session 1906)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Pay by Fire Insurance Companies towards the Upkeep of Fire Brigades.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask Mr. Attorney-General by what Act or Acts London insurance companies are required to pay to the London Fire Brigade the sum of £30 per annum for every million pounds of insurances effected; does this statutory obligation extend outside the area of the London County Council; and, if not, would he consider the possibility of extending this obligation to all the extra Metropolitan districts where efficient fire brigades are established.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) My hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. By Section 13 of 28 and 29 Vic., cap. 90 (The Metropolitan Fire Brigade Act, 1865), companies insuring any property in the Metropolis against fire are required to pay quarterly to the Metropolitan Board of Works (now the London County Council) a contribution towards the expenses of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade at the rate of £35 per annum for every £1,000,000 of the gross amounts insured. Outside the area of the London County Council there is no statutory obligation on fire insurance companies to make any such contribution, except in one or two large towns under the provisions of local Acts; but, in a number of towns and districts, it is the custom of fire-insurance companies to make voluntary payments towards the expenses of dealing with fire. Full information on this subject will be found on page 17 of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Fire Brigades, 1900 (No. 278, of 1900), which recommended that "all fire insurance companies should be required by law to contribute some proportion of the expenses connected with fire extinction, which is an obligation already recognised by some of the most important companies." I am not, however, prepared, as at present advised, to initiate legislation of the kind suggested.

Battleships, etc., Struck off and Laid Down.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state, in parallel columns, for each year from 1st January, 1889, to 31st December, 1906, the number of battleships, coast defence vessels, armoured cruisers, protected cruisers, and destroyers laid down, and the number struck off the list of efficient ships, together with the sum total of each class laid down and struck off during the seventeen years, such period being more or less the life of an armoured vessel.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The information desired is given in the accompanying table :—

Year.	Battleships.		Coast Defence Ships.		Armoured Cruisers.		Protected Cruisers.		Torpedo Boat Destroyers.		Total.	
	Numbers.		Numbers.		Numbers.		Numbers.		Numbers.		Numbers.	
	Laid down.	Struck off.	Laid down.	Struck off.	Laid down.	Struck off.	Laid down.	Struck off.	Laid down.	Struck off.	Laid down.	Struck off.
1889	3	—	—	—	—	—	25	—	—	—	28	—
1890	5	—	—	—	—	—	11	—	—	—	16	—
1891	2	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	6	—
1892	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	4	—	6	—
1893	2	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	6	—	10	1
1894	6	—	—	2	—	1	8	—	32	—	46	3
1895	2	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	12	—	20	—
1896	2	—	—	1	—	—	14	4	35	—	51	5
1897	4	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	1	—	11	—
1898	4	—	—	—	4	—	1	—	6	—	15	—
1899	7	—	—	1	7	1	—	4	16	—	30	6
1900	1	3	—	3	3	6	1	4	2	—	7	16
1901	2	7	—	6	6	1	1	5	1	2	10	21
1902	6	—	—	—	6	—	1	—	15	—	28	—
1903	1	1	—	3	3	—	3	1	4	—	11	5
1904	3	—	—	—	3	5	—	24	15	3	21	32
1905	3	10	—	1	3	5	—	17	2	1	8	34
1906	1	2	—	—	3	—	—	—	4	—	8	2
Totals -	54	24	—	17	38	19	85	59	155	6	332	125

Panama Canal Works—Trinidad Labourers' Contracts.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he will lay upon the Table a copy of the contracts under which Trinidad labourers have been recruited to work on the Panama Canal.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Governor of Trinidad has been requested to supply a copy of the contract for this purpose.

Imprisonment of British Colonists at Nairobi.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Captain Grogan and four other British subjects are now undergoing a sentence of imprisonment at Nairobi, for an offence under the Indian Penal Code; whether the offence complained of consisted in the punishment of some natives for insults offered to white women; whether, in view of the circumstances and of the services rendered by Captain Grogan to East Africa and to this country, the Secretary of State is prepared to advise His Majesty to remit the remainder of the sentence; and when Papers on the subject will be laid upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. According to the Secretary of State's present information these men were charged with holding an unlawful meeting and resisting the police. The officer administering the Government reports that the insult was not of a serious nature, and at most did not amount to more than rudeness and disobedience. He further reports that after collecting upwards of 100 Europeans, of whom many were armed, Captain Grogan and the persons acting with him flogged the three natives concerned in a most brutal manner in front of the Court House at Nairobi, in spite of the attempted intervention of the magistrate and a police officer. The natives were not handed over to the police. As at present informed the Secretary of State sees no reason for revising the sentence of the magistrate's court upon Captain Grogan, and he proposes to defer the question of laying Papers on the Table of the House until he has received full details by mail.

European and Native Population at Nairobi.

MR. CAVE: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, what are the approximate numbers of the white and coloured populations in and about Nairobi; what force of white police is now available for the preservation of order in the district; and whether the Secretary of State is satisfied that the force is sufficient for all purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The population of Nairobi municipality is approximately as follows:—

Europeans . . .	350
Eurasians . . .	94
Goanese . . .	295
Indians . . .	1,752
Africans . . .	2,246
	4,737

but the Secretary of State has no information regarding the numbers in the surrounding districts. Provision for a white police force of twenty non-commissioned officers and men has been made in the Estimates for the current financial year, and the acting Commissioner was authorised by telegram on the 18th of March to raise this force at once. The Commissioner of the Protectorate, who is on leave in this country, has now recommended that the force should be increased to forty non-commissioned officers and men, and the Secretary of State has no doubt that this force will be sufficient to maintain order.

Balances in Hands of Boards of Guardians.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the total amount of balances in hand and surpluses now in the hands of the guardians of England and Wales over and above that needed for current expenditure.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have no information as to the amount of the balances now in the hands of boards of guardians in England and Wales.

MR. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that many boards of guardians in London levy a rate greater than their current expenditure, thus leading to balances in hand and surpluses amounting to many thousands of pounds; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps to stop this practice.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am not aware that it is the practice of many boards of guardians in London to call for excessive contributions from the rates, nor have I received any recent complaints on the subject. It must be borne in mind that where the expenditure is large it is necessary that the guardians should have a considerable working balance in hand.

Housing of the Working Classes Bill—Date of Introduction.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he is now in a position to fix a date for the introduction of the Bill for the Improvement of the Housing of the Working Classes promised in the King's Speech.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am desirous of introducing the Bill as early as practicable, but I cannot at present fix a date for the purpose.

Pay of Male Clerical Staff of the Post Office Telephone Service.

SIR J. BAKER (Portsmouth): To ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the fact that the male clerical staff of the general manager of the Post Office London Telephone Service forwarded a memorial in December, 1905, after four years service, asking for better pay and conditions of service, that the Select Committee on Postal Servants was approached and informed the memorialists that their case did not come within its terms of reference, and further that the female staff employed in the same office is already established, and that two years service has been accepted as the basis of establishment of the National Telephone Company's staff when the company is taken over by the Post Office, whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the character of the work performed by the memorialists, and take steps for the early provision of an establishment for them, with pay and conditions of service equal to those granted to established officers in the service of the Department for similar work.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The question of placing the male clerical staff of the general manager of the Post Office London Telephone Service on the establishment is now being proceeded with; but the matter requires careful investigation and consideration, and some little time is necessary for the completion of the scheme.

The Police Superannuation Bill.

MR. BRODIE: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of certain hardships existing under The Police Act, 1890, the Government will give special facilities to the Police Superannuation Bill now before Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I cannot promise that special facilities will be given for this Bill.

Wages of Agricultural Labourers.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he can state the last available figures as to the average rate of weekly wages paid to agricultural labourers in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland respectively, with the highest and lowest average weekly earnings in each country.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The latest available figures are contained in the Second Report on Wages and Earnings of Agricultural Labourers [Cd. 2376], and relate to the year 1902, but information furnished to the Department by correspondents from time to time since that year tends to show that, in 1906, wages were generally at about the same level as in 1902. The following figures, extracted from the above-mentioned Report, show, for each division of the United Kingdom, the average weekly earnings of agricultural labourers (including all payments in cash and the value of allowances in kind) in 1902* :—

	England.		Wales.		Scotland.		Ireland.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
All classes of agricultural labourers (including ordinary labourers and men in charge of animals) - -	18	3	17	3	19	3	10	11
Ordinary agricultural labourers only -	17	5	17	7	19	5	10	9

In the case of the ordinary agricultural labourers, the following statement shows the highest and lowest county averages in 1902.

	Highest.			Lowest.		
		s.	d.		s.	d.
England -	Durham - - -	22	2	Oxford - - - -	14	6
Wales -	Glamorgan - - -	21	3	Cardigan - - -	15	8
Scotland -	Renfrew and Lanark -	22	2	Shetland, Orkney, and Caithness - - -	13	7
Ireland -	Down - - - -	13	0	Mayo - - - -	8	9

---

* These averages relate to able-bodied male adults. They do not include the earnings of stewards, bailiffs, foremen, or casual labourers.

Accidents to Railway Servants.

SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what has been in each year, from the year 1896 to the year 1906, inclusive, the number of railway servants killed by accidents in which the movement of vehicles used exclusively on railways was concerned, the number of instances in which such fatal accidents to railway servants have been investigated by inspectors or sub-inspectors of the Board of Trade, the number of inquests held in respect of such fatal accidents to railway servants, and the number of instances in which the coroner at any such inquest has applied to the Board of Trade for an official assessor at such inquest, in pursuance of Section 8 of The Railways Regulation Act, 1871.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) A statement is attached showing the number of railway servants killed during the period mentioned by my hon. friend by train accidents and other accidents arising from the movement of railway vehicles, the number killed in such accidents as were investigated by the inspecting staff of the Board of Trade, and the number killed in cases in which the coroners holding the inquests asked for the appointment of an assessor. I have no knowledge of the number of inquests held, but it may, I think, be safely assumed that every fatal accident to a railway servant forms the subject of a coroner's inquest, or, in Scotland, of an inquiry by the procurator fiscal.

Year.	Number of railway servants killed in the movement of railway vehicles.	Number killed in accidents into which inquiries were held.	Number killed in cases in which coroners applied for assessors.
1896 - -	447	76	—
1897 - -	510	89	3
1898 - -	504	104	1
1899 - -	531	83	3
1900 - -	583	109	3
1901 - -	511	101	3
1902 - -	447	123	—
1903 - -	455	121	1
1904 - -	416	155	4
1905 - -	399	156	3
1906 - -	438	157	6

Children and Council and Voluntary Schools.

MR. ARMITAGE (Leeds, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the number of places provided in council schools on 31st December, 1906, or the nearest date for which the information is available; the number of children on the register at the same date; the number of average attendances; and if he will give the like information with regard to non-provided schools.

(*Answered by Mr McKenna.*) Accommodation on the 31st July, 1906:—

Council schools - -	3,520,093
Voluntary schools - -	3,509,914

Average number on the registers for the statistical year ending 31st July, 1906:—

Council schools - -	3,199,050
Voluntary schools - -	2,842,654

Average attendance for the statistical year ending 31st July, 1906:—

Council schools - -	2,812,570
Voluntary schools - -	2,490,525

No later figures than those given above are available.

Sedition of Bombay Newspaper.

MR. REES: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the editor and publisher of a Bombay newspaper called the *Vihari* has been bound over by the Chief Presidency of Bombay to be of good behaviour for six months for publishing an article describing British India as Hell on Earth, and the English as surpassing Nero, Nadir Shah, Tamerlane, and Satan in cruelty, so that their success causes the mercy of God to be doubted in the world; and whether it is the intention of the Government of India to move for a sentence more proportionate to the effect of the publication of such statements among the masses of the Bombay Presidency.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have seen a report of the case. So far as I am aware, the Government of India do not intend to take any action.

Opium Exported from India.

MR. PIKE PEASE: To ask the Secretary of State for India what was the total value of the opium exported from India in 1906, and the value of that consigned direct to ports in China.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The value of the opium exported from India in the year 1906, as shown in the trade returns, was £6,128,016, of which £4,806,452 represents opium consigned direct to Hongkong and the treaty ports in China.

Suggested Increased Allowances for Officers serving in South Africa.

MR. BRODIE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is able to do something to diminish the serious burden placed upon officers by service in South Africa, and whether he can allow the same rate of pay in South Africa as in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of the alleged inadequacy of the allowances granted to officers serving in South Africa was very fully considered quite recently, and it was decided that there were not sufficient grounds to justify any increase. The difference in the circumstances of officers serving in India and South Africa makes any comparison of their respective emoluments of doubtful value, but I observe that in the junior ranks of the infantry the total amount of pay and allowances is higher in South Africa than in India.

The Sherwood Foresters—Coloured Facings to Uniforms.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that several regiments have been allowed to return to having their old coloured facings on their uniform, permission will also be given to another regiment with a very famous record, the Sherwood Foresters, the old Forty-fifth, again to have green on theirs.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This proposal was fully considered on the previous recent occasion, and it was held that the application could not be entertained. I am not prepared to reopen the question.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Cost of Naval Construction.

MR. NUTTALL (Lancashire, Stretford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty the total estimated cost of the nine battleships and ten armoured cruisers which, as stated in the Navy Estimates, will be completed by 1909; and whether the nine battleships include four ships of the "Dreadnought" type, but exclude the three ships of that type the construction of which it is proposed shall be commenced this year.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The total cost is approximately £29,000,000. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative.

Cost of H.M.S. "Invincible."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, why the cost of the "Invincible," as given in the White Paper, Cd. 3048, issued last session, is now increased from £1,736,645 to £1,744,055; and whether he can explain why this vessel building at Elswick is to cost £34,145 more than a sister ship building on the Clyde.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Answer to the first part of the Question is that the lower figure included sums which were not finally determined at the time the estimate was made, whereas the higher figure represents a contract price. As regards the second part, there are slight differences in the arrangement of details of the ships building on the Tyne and Clyde which contribute to a variation in price.

Cost of H.M.S. "Dreadnought."

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in spite of the fact that the "Dreadnought" has been in commission since last October, the Navy Estimates do not present a true account of her cost in that they exclude the cost of her reserve of guns; and whether this practice of excluding the cost of the reserve of guns has been followed in the case of any previous ships.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The reserve of guns provided is calculated upon the total number mounted, and individual guns are not appropriated to particular ships except where only one ship exists with a particular type of gun. The cost of reserve guns is not included in cost of guns shown in the Estimates, and has not been included with previous ships. The Estimates, therefore, give a correct account of the cost of the "Dreadnought."

Battleship Reserve Guns.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the reserve guns of the "Dreadnought" are now ready to be placed on board that vessel; and whether the reserve guns of the "Lord Nelson" and "Agamemnon" are ordered to be completed by the time those vessels are ready, and are included in the cost of the armament of those ships as set forth in the Navy Estimates.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The replies to the first and second parts of the Question are in the affirmative, and to the third part in the negative.

Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the continued lack of employment at Woolwich in consequence of the Royal Arsenal having to bear the whole, or nearly the whole, of the loss of orders attendant upon the Government declaration to reduce expenditure; and whether, having regard to the fact that 15,000 men have been discharged from the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, during the last four or five years, he can now say whether he will stop any further discharges.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will instruct the Army Council to place such orders with the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, as will obviate the dismissal of the 1,200 men who have received warning of discharge.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I will answer both Questions together. Yes, Sir, my attention has been drawn to the continued diminution of work at Woolwich referred to by my hon. friend, but the reason is not that stated by him. The reductions are the outcome of general reductions in naval and military expenditure. Except rifle and small arms ammunition, as to which sufficient proportions have been ordered from the ordnance factories to keep the respective shops in work with present staffs, practically all the new orders on Army Votes for articles made in the ordnance factories are being placed with them. The fact is, that there is not work to keep the present staff employed, and further discharges appear to be inevitable. I have, however, postponed the operation of the notices of discharge temporarily in order to mitigate hardships as far as possible, and I am in anxious consultation with the Admiralty as to the possibility of finding further work for this year. There are certain articles which public policy requires us to place in a certain proportion for manufacture by the trade, but it is not any unusual allocation of these articles which has led to the present difficulty.

MR. CROOKS: Will the right hon. Gentleman facilitate the payment of bonuses to the men now in the Arsenal, so that they may get away quickly when opportunity offers, and make vacancies for those who are not successful in getting jobs elsewhere?

MR. HALDANE asked for notice of the Question.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of appointing a small expert Committee to discuss the possibility of employing the plant at these places fully in both peace time and war time.

MR. HALDANE: We have such a Committee now.

Army Bill and the Militia and Volunteer Officers.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the effect of the new Army Bill will be to merge the officers of the Militia and Volunteers into one class, receiving the same allowances and emoluments and undertaking the same duties both as to time and place.

MR. HALDANE: The reply is in the affirmative.

Indian Legislative Councils.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received the Report from the Government of India upon the question referred to them last year of widening the powers and responsibilities of the legislative councils; and whether he can conveniently communicate the Report to the House before the Indian Budget is taken.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): On last Saturday I received a despatch dealing with the subject of my hon. friend's Question; but at present I am not in a position to make a statement or to lay any Papers on the Table of the House. It is a long and important despatch and calls for mature consideration.

MR. SMEATON: Will the right hon. Gentleman enable the House to consider and discuss the Report before he takes a decision upon it?

MR. MORLEY: No, Sir. By all usage, and certainly by all expediency, I must answer that despatch on the responsibility of His Majesty's Government. But I anticipate that before any action is taken the House will have an opportunity of considering the matter.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is in a position to say whether the recommendations contained in the despatch will involve legislation, or whether they can be decided by mere Executive action?

MR. MORLEY: I must ask my hon. friend to excuse me from saying anything on the subject at present.

Native Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any natives of the British Central Africa Protectorate have been recruited for the Transvaal mines since the departure of those mentioned in the Commissioners Report for 1905–6; and whether such recruiting is still permissible and proceeding.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): Five hundred natives of the British Central Africa Protectorate were recruited for the Premier Diamond Mine during the last recruiting season which ended on the 31st of December; the next season for recruiting commences on the 1st of July; the question whether further recruiting will then be permitted is under the consideration of the Secretary of State.

*MR. REES: Has any occasion arisen for the exercise of the Under-Secretary's promised kind offices on behalf of the Protectorate in connection with the Anglo-Portuguese Labour Convention?

MR. CHURCHILL: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Sir A. Swettenham's Resignation.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): On behalf of the hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the resignation of the late Governor of Jamaica was occasioned by consideration of age; whether age was assigned by the late Governor as the reason of his retirement; and, if not, on what ground was the resignation officially expressed to be the result of age.

MR. CHURCHILL: The resignation of Sir Alexander Swettenham of his office as Governor of Jamaica was tendered upon 24th January last in a telegram couched in the following words: "Respectfully apply for permission for retirement on account of age, forthwith to be relieved."

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) asked whether the recent unfortunate incidents which took place in Jamaica had any connection with the resignation of Sir Alexander Swettenham.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is not included in the Question on the Paper. I do not think it would be any advantage at this stage if I were to try to specify the circumstances which were and those which were not connected with the resignation.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): Will the whole of the correspondence be laid on the Table?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I cannot yet say what part of the correspondence may properly be laid. Certainly the whole of the correspondence is not of a character suitable for publication.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: But are we to understand that other causes beside that of age dictated the resolve taken by Sir Alexander Swettenham?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the correspondence will be laid?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think the right hon. Gentleman had better put down a Question on that subject. * The correspondence affects other Governments besides our own, and it must be very carefully considered, from every point of view, by the Foreign Office as well as by the Colonial Office, before any decision can be come to in regard to publication.

The Bahr-el-Ghazal.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that Congo Free State troops are still occupying four stations in the Bahr-el-Ghazal, and that the Lado enclave is occupied by a force of 1,800 men; and, if so, whether he can explain the reasons which induce the Congo Free State administration to maintain so large a military force within striking distance of British territory.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury; for Sir Edward Grey): My right hon. friend understands that telegraphic instructions have now been sent to the Congolese Commandant at Lado, ordering the evacuation of all posts in Meridi.

Sale of Revolvers.

Mr. G. H. FABER (Boston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, in view of his commutation of the death sentence in a recent case of planned and deliberate murder, he proposes to take any measures to restrict the sale of revolvers to such applicants only as shall have obtained a magistrate's certificate as to the necessity of the purchase.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): I am informed that the Pistols Act of 1903 has proved satisfactory in diminishing crime connected with the carrying of pistols, and I do not at present contemplate undertaking its extension or amendment. No possible amendment of the Act would prevent the class of murders which can be described as "planned and deliberate."

St. Pancras Unemployed.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board how many unemployed in St. Pancras were registered from January 1906 to March 1907 in each month respectively, and how many in each successive month were given employment through the committee; what was the nature of the work given to these men; what requests for money or help were made by the St. Pancras Unemployed Committee to the Local Government Board during the last fifteen months; and what money grants to this body have been made by the Local Government Board during that period.

*The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): I am informed that the total number of the unemployed registered by the St. Pancras Distress Committee from January 1906 to March 1907 was 2,567. The total number of persons in each month for whom work was provided through the committee was approximately 2,316. Of these 999 were employed on work provided by the borough council, eighty-eight on local work to which the Central (Unemployed) Body contributed, and 1,229 on work provided by that body. I will send my hon. friend a statement showing the particulars for each month. The work provided by the borough council consisted of extra road sweeping, painting lamp-posts, and general labouring work. The local work to which the Central Body contributed consisted of reducing the gradient of a road and laying out gardens. Payments out of the parliamentary grant were in London made not to the Distress Committees, but to the Central (Unemployed) Body, and no request for a payment from the grant was received by the Local Government Board from the St. Pancras Distress Committee.

Leicester Distress Committee.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he would lay upon the Table the letter from the Leicester Distress Committee indicating that the committee required no more money from the Local Government Board.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The letter forms part of a correspondence between the Local Government Board and the Distress Committee, and refers to other portions of that correspondence. It does not seem to me necessary to lay the letter on the Table of the House, but I shall be happy to send my hon. friend a copy of it.

Rifle Ranges for Postal Officials.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the roof of the General Post Office has been converted into a rifle range where postal employees are taught rifle practice; if so, by whose authority a branch of the civil service is being used to assist the military service; whether any alteration has been made in the roof to adapt it to the purposes of a rifle range, and who authorised the alterations to be made; what the alterations cost, and who paid for them; whether any expenses are incurred in teaching the postal youths and employees how to shoot; and, if so, who pays the expenses.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): A miniature rifle range has recently been erected on the roof of the Savings Bank building at West Kensington and another is about to be erected on the roof of the General Post Office North. The space in question is not required for any other purpose. The ranges will be used by Post Office employees in connection with their drill. All expenses in connection with their erection and maintenance are defrayed by the officers concerned, who have formed clubs for the purpose and no cost whatever will fall on public funds. I have every desire to facilitate the formation of such clubs, which are entirely of a civil character and have no connection with military service.

Sharlston Elementary School Teacher.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that Mr. O. B. Milnes has fulfilled his duties as head teacher at the Sharlston elementary school in a most satisfactory manner; that the West Riding education authority have refused to consent to the appointment of Mr. Milnes by the managers of the Royston national school as head teacher to that school on educational grounds; that Mr. Marvin, the inspector sent by the Board of Education, on their being appealed to by the managers to inquire into the circumstances of the case, reported that Mr. Milnes was one of the most deserving of the younger men in his district, and very strongly recommended him for the appointment; and that the Board informed the authority on 30th January, that Mr. Milnes' career, as shown in the reports of His Majesty's Inspectors, presents an unbroken record of success and good deserts under very adverse circumstances, and advised the authority to reconsider their decision: and will he say on what ground or fresh information the Board have, since that time, completely reversed their decision.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The facts are substantially as stated, except that the Board of Education have not reversed any previous decision. Their powers in such cases are limited by the Education Act, 1902, to determining whether the local education authority withheld their consent to the appointment of a teacher on educational grounds. It was clear that the West

Riding County Council withheld their consent to Mr. Milnes' appointment on educational grounds, and on finding that the council were not prepared to reconsider their action in the matter, the Board had no alternative under the Statute but to decide accordingly.

Mr. LANE-FOX asked whether the Board of Education had not some option of deciding whether the grounds urged were genuine or not. Was the right hon. Gentleman aware that the grounds alleged were based entirely on a visit lasting only three-quarters of an hour, and on six questions put to particular people? Was it not unfair that a promising teacher should be under the stigma of being inefficient?

Mr. McKENNA: The Board of Education have to satisfy themselves that the decision was come to on educational grounds. There is no shadow of doubt that the decision in the present case was come to on those grounds.

Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House what the educational grounds were?

Mr. McKENNA: Certainly.

Viscount TURNOUR: Will the right hon. Gentleman do so?

Mr. McKENNA: I do not think that this is the occasion to do that.

Mr. LANE-FOX: Is the right hon. Gentleman satisfied that the teacher has been fairly treated in this matter?

Mr. McKENNA: I do not think I am called upon to express any opinion upon that point.

Molascuit.

Mr. LEA: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that a new process for using the by-products of the sugar-cane, called molascuit, has been recently devoloped, and that it can be imported and sold at a price to be of considerable advantage both to the British stock feeder and the Colonial sugar-cane grower; and will he take steps to bring this product before the agriculturists in this country by drawing attention to it through the Board's publications.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): Our attention has been directed to the feeding-stuff to which my hon. friend refers, but we do not see our way to call special attention to it in our publications. It will doubtless be brought to the notice of stockowners through the usual channels.

Labourers' Cottages in County Down.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Down, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the Exchequer grant for the purpose of the Labourers Acts made to county Down for the financial year ending in 1906; and what will be the corresponding grant of the same county under the Labourers Act of 1906 for 1907–8.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): The share of the county Down for the financial year ended 31st March, 1906, was £2,010. Its share for the year 1907–8 on the basis of distribution established by the Labourers Act of last session will be, approximately, £297. The alteration of the method of distribution was, as I have already explained, made for the purpose of securing an equitable allocation of the grant amongst the several rural districts in which cottages have been provided. It was manifestly unfair that county Down should receive £2,010 in respect of 235 cottages, or about £8 11s. 0d. per cottage, while county Limerick, for example, received only £1,553 for 2,647 cottages, or about 11s. 9d. per cottage. Under the new system all districts will be paid out of the grant at a uniform rate of £1 8s. 8d. per cottage for every cottage provided before the 1st November, 1906.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman of opinion that this change in the law in reference to the grant is likely to facilitate the building of cottages in county Down?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is a question as to a matter of opinion and is not in order.

The Drainage of the Barrow.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the medical evidence given before the Barrow Drainage Commission in 1885 by William Neale, M.D., medical officer, Mountmellick dispensary district, to the effect that houses were annually rendered unfit for habitation, and whole families had to leave in flood times and were huddled together in most unsanitary houses, public health seriously injured, malaria and typhoid fever and diphtheria prevalent in consequence of the floods, and that no adequate sewerage for the town was possible, and the water supply was contaminated; and whether, having regard to the fact that the evils arising from the flooding have increased since this evidence was given twenty-two years ago, he will take steps to provide an effectual remedy.

The following Questions on the same subject also appeared on the Paper—

MR. MEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Arterial Drainage Commission, dated 23rd February 1907, in which it is stated, pages 9 and 10, that for fifty years the state of the Barrow has been the subject of acute complaint, that nothing save the making of maps, plans and estimates has yet been done by the State or by any combination of owners towards curing or even mitigating the evils complained of, whilst they had abundant testimony that the flooding and consequent injury grow greater year by year, that the case of this river basin differs from others in Ireland, once similarly circumstanced, in that no expenditure by the State has ever taken place, although the task of clearing the main outfall is manifestly far beyond the reach of private enterprise, and that they therefore feel that the case of the Barrow calls for exceptional and early treatment, and the existence of surveys, maps and plans already referred to removes the difficulty that might otherwise exist in taking such action; and whether, in view of this declaration, he will provide an immediate remedy.

MR. MEEHAN: To ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the medical evidence given before the Barrow Drainage Commission, 1885, by Sir Francis P. M'Cabe, M.D., F.R.C.S.I., Local Government Board inspector, to the effect that the result of the flooding over an estimated area of 3,400 square miles was most injurious to the public health of the country, developed constitutional diseases, pulmonary phthisis, bronchial and catarrhal affections, acute and chronic rheumatism, and predisposed to lunacy, enteric and typhus fever, bog-lameness and chronic rheumatism in cattle, and fluke or liver rot in sheep; and, seeing that these evils have been in existence over fifty years and have increased since this evidence was given twenty-two years ago, whether he will provide any remedy.

MR. MEEHAN: To ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been to the Report of a Committee consisting of the Parliamentary and local representatives of Kildare, Carlow, King's and Queen's counties, formed to promote the drainage of the River Barrow, which Report was forwarded to him on the 16th June 1906; whether he is aware that in the Report of the Arterial Drainage Commission, dated 23rd February 1907, it is stated in reference to the Barrow that this river basin differs from others in Ireland, once similarly circumstanced, in that no expenditure by the State has ever taken place, although the task of clearing the main outfall is manifestly beyond private enterprise, and that the case of the Barrow calls for exceptional and early treatment; and whether he will provide the £50,000 asked for by the Committee.

MR. BIRRELL: I will answer all these Questions together. I regret that I can only repeat the Answer which I gave on 20th March to the hon. Member's previous Questions on this subject.† As he is aware, the Arterial Drainage Commission has only recently reported. The Appendix containing the evidence has not yet been presented to Parliament. It is, however, in the printer's hands and will shortly be ready. When the evidence has been received it will be necessary to consider the recommendations of the Commission as a whole in order to decide what legislation may be necessary, and this will take time. It is obvious that in the meantime it will not be possible or desirable to consider the question of undertaking a drainage scheme for the Barrow or any other particular river.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 823–6.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that no fewer than three Commissions have supported this recommendation, and cannot he do something to remedy the present state of things?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not denying the importance of the question or that the Commissions have reported as stated. But the question is of such importance and involves so much expenditure that obviously I must take time to consider my decision.

Keelnabrack School.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in allocating the new building grant, regard will be had for the necessity of building a new school at Curraheen, Glenbeigh, in place of the existing Keelnabrack school, which has been reported as unsafe and unsuitable.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, in allocating the funds to be placed at their disposal for the erection and improvement of vested school-houses, they will consider the case of the proposed new school in question on its merits, having due regards to the funds available and to the claims of other urgent cases.

Glencar Potato Crop Failure.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the people of Glencar, county Kerry, applied for a free grant of seed potatoes from the Department of Agriculture owing to the partial failure of the potato crop in some townlands and the complete failure in other townlands; and can he say why they were refused subsequently seed potatoes, seed oats, lime, and manure under the same conditions as were granted in the neighbouring parish of Glenbeigh, in view of the fact that Glencar is not so favourably situated for procuring sand and seaweed.

Mr. BIRRELL: It does not fall within the province ef the Department of Agriculture to make free grants of seed potatoes. The Department have made arrangements for establishing demonstration plots in some of the congested districts, including the district of Killorglin, and in this connection small quantities of seed potatoes, seed oats, lime, and manure have been sold to certain persons in the latter district. The objects of these plots is to demonstrate the advantages of change of seed, and the use of lime and artificial manures. The Department have found it impossible owing to the limited funds at their disposal, to arrange for demonstration plots this year at Glencar. The question of extending these operations to other districts next year will receive consideration in due course.

Mr. Packenham's Mullingar Estate.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are aware that Mr. E. M. Packenham, owner of an estate in the Mullingar rural district, comprising 1,900 acres of untenanted and non-residential land surrounded by uneconomic holdings, is now attempting, by selling the latter and retaining the former, to perpetuate the condition of things which Parliament desires to relieve; and whether, in view of the number of industious young men obliged to emigrate from that district every year for want of land, the Commissioners will, in exercise of their statutory powers, refuse to sanction the sale of any part of this estate unless the whole is offered for sale and a map of the whole is furnished to them.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are not aware of the facts alleged in the Question. The Commissioners have, with the owner's consent, arranged to have a preliminary inspection made of some 2,700 acres of untenanted land in the districts of Delvin and Mullingar, with a view to considering the question of purchasing it. The inspection will be made as soon as possible.

Evicted Tenants' Bill and Future Tenants.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland whether, in preparing the promised Evicted Tenants Bill, he has considered the claims of the number of persons who have been technically evicted under Section 7 of the Land Law Act of 1887, and who are now future tenants, precluded from having judicial rents fixed except with the unobtainable permission of their landlords; and whether he will embody in the Bill any provision for opening the courts to those people.

MR. BIRRELL: The Government have no record of the number of persons served with eviction notices under the section quoted who are now future tenants. I am not prepared to make any statement as to the possibility or desirability of extending to future tenants the fair rent provisions of the Land Acts.

General Fetherstonhaugh's Estate.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the date upon which the Estates Commissioners received a memorial praying them to purchase, for distribution among necessitous people, General Richard Fetherstonhaugh's evicted and untenanted lands; the dates upon which the Commissioners communicated with that owner on the subject; the nature of his replies, if any; and whether there is any prospect of the lands in question, or any of the evicted lands belonging to that owner, being acquired for distribution.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners received memorials from the tenants in question on 12th January, 1906, and 21st November, 1906. As the first memorial stated that the property was being sold, the Commissioners took no steps, expecting that the matter would come before them in the ordinary course. As no proceedings for the sale of the estate were instituted before the Commissioners, they wrote to the owner on 2nd November inquiring whether he was prepared to sell his estate, but received no reply. They again wrote to him on 5th March, but so far without result.

Crannagh Farm Boycott.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that on 18th March the Ballina Board of Guardians passed a boycotting resolution in reference to the tenants upon the Crannagh farm, and that on 1st April the same body made it a condition of the appointment of Dr. Isaac Clarke as temporary medical officer to the local dispensary district that he should use his influence to induce his uncle to relinquish his tenancy of the Crannagh farm; and whether he proposes to take any action in reference to this matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The guardian's minutes of 18th March do not contain any resolution of the nature referred to in the Question, and I have no information that any such resolution was passed. The Local Government Board have no official knowledge that the condition alluded to was made by the guardians when appointing Dr. Clarke. The question of sanctioning Dr. Clarke's appointment is at present under the consideration of the Local Government Board.

United Irish League and Gore Booth Estate Tenant.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Edward Layng has yielded up his holding on the Gore-Booth estate, Streamstown, as ordered by the Mullinabreena branch of the United Irish League; and whether the Estates Commissioners obeyed the demand of the same authority to send an official to take possession of the holding and pay Edward Layng the sum of £190 as agreed upon.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have no information as to the communications, if any, which may have passed between Edward Layng and the local branch of the United Irish League, nor have the Commissioners acted in the matter in obedience to any demand of that organisation. The Commissioners, at the desire of all the parties, including the landlord, endeavoured to effect an amicable settlement of the case and to reinstate John Quinn, the evicted tenant, and in this they have succeeded. Layng has been paid a sum of £190 as compensation for surrendering the holding.

MR. LONSDALE: Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to a paragraph in the *Sligo Champion* in which it is stated that the following resolutions were unanimously passed at a meeting of the Mullinabreena branch of the United Irish League—"That with reference to the evicted holding of John Quinn on the Gore-Booth estate, Streamstown, county Sligo, we call on the Estates Commissioners to send an official here to take up possession of the evicted holding and pay the present occupier (Edward Layng) the sum of £190 in cash as already agreed upon." "That having the correspondence in reference to re-instatement of John Quinn before us, and knowing as we do the unreliability of Edward Layng's word, we hereby declare that nothing but the immediate surrender of John Quinn's holding by Edward Layng will satisfy this League, and as the Estates Commissioners are quite willing to pay him the £190 compensation any day he gives up possession we demand that Mr. Layng give up possession on the 1st March, and we call on the people to take note of this resolution."

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I rise to order. If I am not mistaken it has been the practice at the Table to refuse to allow Questions to be put on the Paper asking if a Minister's attention has been directed to a statement in a newspaper, and then quoting that statement. Is it not equally out of order to quote newspaper statements in like manner in a supplementary Question?

MR. LONSDALE: My Question is if the right hon. Gentleman's attention has been directed to an order issued by the United Irish League.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member was quoting from a newspaper, and newspaper quotations are not allowed to appear in Questions on the Paper; presumably, therefore, they are not in order in supplementary Questions.

MR. LONSDALE: But this resolution was passed by the branch.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member began by asking if the attention of the right hon. Gentleman had been directed to a statement in a newspaper, which he proceeded to read. That is not in order.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of his colleagues has joined the United Irish League?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question.

Irish Poor Law Administration.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether His Majesty's Government have any intention of submitting proposals to Parliament for the reform of Poor Law administration in Ireland on the lines of the recommendations of the Viceregal Commission.

MR. BIRRELL: I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for North Kilkenny on 5th March.†

Crannagh Farm Boycott.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a boycott has been instituted against the tenants of the Crannagh farm, in county Mayo, who have refused to give up their holdings at the bidding of the United Irish League; whether these persons are refused the necessaries of life by shopkeepers, prevented by crowds from working upon the holdings for which they are paying rent, and have been prevented from attending Mass at the Ardagh Roman Catholic Church; and what steps have been taken to protect these persons in the exercise of their lawful rights.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that the persons in question have not been boycotted or prevented from working upon their holdings. It is, however, the fact that public feeling has been manifested against them, and the police are informed that on one occasion three of the tenants were prevented from attending Mass. The police have afforded full protection to the persons concerned, five men being employed on the duty. A police hut is in course of erection at the spot.

MR. LONSDALE: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information that twelve tenants under stress of the boycott have served notice to surrender their holdings, and that at a meeting held on Easter

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 648.

Sunday it was decided to pursue the campaign of boycotting until the remaining tenants are forced into submission?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no information as to that.

MR. LONSDALE: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes.

Protestant Children in Catholic Schools.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the new rule issued by the Commissioners of National Education requiring that in schools under Protestant management, where a substantial minority of the children belong to one religious denomination, an assistant teacher of the denomination of the minority shall be appointed if the average attendance permits; why has this rule been made applicable only to schools under Protestant management; and whether it is intended to apply it to all national schools in Ireland without distinction of creed.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education have furnished me with a copy of the new rule referred to, which provides that in schools under Protestant management in which a substantial majority of the pupils belong to one religious denomination the principal teacher should be of that denomination, and that when a substantial minority of the children belong to another religious denomination an assistant teacher of that denomination should be appointed, if the average attendance permits. Having regard to the comparatively small number of schools under Roman Catholic management in which there is a substantial minority of Protestant pupils, the Commissioners do not consider the arrangement to be feasible in the case of such schools. The aim of the Commissioners in making the rule has been to remove, as far as possible, the obstacles to the education in common schools of all denominations of Protestants, so that, so far at least as these schools are concerned, the fundamental principle of the national system may be carried out.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are many schools in Ireland under Roman Catholic management which are attended by a considerable minority of Protestant children? Are they to be allowed a teacher of their own faith?

MR. BIRRELL: As far as I can make out the number of Protestant children attending Catholic schools is too small to permit of the rule being applied.

Elphin Disturbances.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any information respecting the agrarian disturbances at Elphin, county Roscommon, on Easter Sunday and Monday; and whether he will state the number of police now in the district engaged in protecting the lives and property of persons who have been denounced by the United Irish League.

MR. BIRRELL: On Sunday, 31st March, a large crowd accompanied by bands assembled at Elphin with the intention, as previously announced, of demonstrating in the vicinity of local grazing farms. An extra force of seventy police was drafted into Elphin with the object of preserving the peace on the occasion, and this force prevented the crowd from approaching the grazing farms. The force remained on duty at Elphin on the following day, but no further demonstration took place. The police force at Elphin station has been temporarily strengthened by the addition of six men from neighbouring stations, and a further force will be brought to the district if necessary.

Irish Local Government Officials.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that of the forty-seven nominated officials in the Local Government Board (Ireland) thirteen are Catholics, whose salaries aggregate £7,550, whilst the remaining thirty-four are mainly Episcopalians, whose salaries aggregate £22,225; whether he is aware that similar complaints are made about nearly all Government Departments in Ireland; and whether he can take steps, by limiting the right of nomination or otherwise, to terminate the evil of religious ascendancy in such departments.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have no record of the religious persuasion of members of their staff. As regards the concluding part of the Question, I can only assure the hon. Member that fitness for any given post, and not religious denomination, will be the test applied by His Majesty's Government in making appointments in Ireland.

Hillsborough Labourers' Cottage Rents.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the fact that the Hillsborough Rural District Council, West County Down, has decided to raise the rents of the labourers' cottages in their area; that the chairman and the rent collector warned the council that the result would be to empty the cottages, and that the councillor who proposed the increase replied that that was the very thing they wanted to do; whether the Local Government Board will refuse to sanction this resolution; and whether the Board will at the same time take steps to compel the council to consider the representations for further cottages, having regard to the declarations of the councillors that they will not build any more cottages.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board are aware that the facts are substantially as stated in the Question. Under Section 29 of the Act of last session the rural district council is required to make regulations dealing, amongst other things, with the rents to be charged for labourers' cottages, and such regulations do not come into force until confirmed by the Local Government Board. No regulations have yet been received from the rural district council in question. A special meeting of the council is to be held on 6th May for the purpose of considering all representations for labourers' cottages which they have received.

Barnmeen School House.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the condition of the schoolhouse at Barnmeen, county Down, and to the fact that no less than four inspectors of the National Board have reported it to be old, unsuitable, badly lighted, and imperfectly ventilated; whether he is aware that the only means of ventilation is by the door, that the window frames are decayed and will not hold the glass, that the structure is built partly of clay, and that the eyesight and general health of the children has been impaired; whether he is aware that the manager of the school, Reverend T. Gallery, P.P., has been endeavouring for years to have a new school provided near to the present school, but that the Commissioners of National Education have refused to sanction the building of a new school on the only site available in the whole district; and whether, having regard to the opinion of the people of the neighbourhood, and to the interests of the children and of education, he will advise the Board to waive its objection as to the new site being within the proscribed distance from another school.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that their inspectors have reported that the existing schoolhouse at Barnmeen is unsuitable for school purposes, and the Commissioners are satisfied that steps ought to be taken to provide suitable accommodation. They are, however, precluded by their rules from making a grant, except in special circumstances, towards the erection of a new schoolhouse when there is a vested school within three miles of the proposed new school. In the present case there are two vested schools under the same manager within one and three-quarter miles of Barnmeen. In these circumstances the Commissioners have felt obliged to refuse the manager's application for a grant, and they see no sufficient reason for departing from that decision, more especially as there are a large number of cases to be dealt with and the available funds are limited.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this rule as to the three-mile limit has only lately been introduced? Is he aware also that there is no other site available for the school?

Mr. BIRRELL: I will make inquiry.

Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin.

MR. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Treasury have received a memorial from the staff of the Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, complaining of the increase of work, and asking for an increase of salary in consequence of increased duties; whether the memorial has been considered; if not, when is it likely to be dealt with; whether he is aware that dissatisfaction prevails amongst the staff; and whether they will receive an increase of salary for the extra duties performed.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The memorial referred to has now been received, and is under consideration. I am not at present in a position to make any statement on the subject.

Irish Board of Works Staff.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state if at any time subsequent to the appointment of Mr. Williams as Secretary of the Board of Works in Ireland any correspondence passed between him and the Civil Service Commissioners with reference to the religious opinions of clerks appointed to the Board of Works; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table a copy of the correspondence.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Civil Service Commissioners inform me that they know nothing of any such correspondence.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): May I ask the Minister in charge what business it is intended to take to-morrow?

MR. MORLEY said it was proposed to take further discussion of the Rules of Procedure.

MR. BALFOUR: I do not suppose there is any possibility of finishing the debate on the Army Bill to-night. That is clearly out of the question, but may I ask if it is intended to divide the discussion on the Second Reading of the Bill, and in the interim to take Procedure Rules *de die in diem* until they are concluded?

MR. MORLEY: I understand the discussion on the Procedure Rules will be completed to-morrow. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will defer the remainder of his Question until the Prime Minister returns.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR desired to know when it was intended to proceed with the proposal in reference to the House of Lords.

[No Answer was returned.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure (in respect of the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill): The Lord Advocate; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Provision of Meals) Scotland) Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

Report to lie upon the Table.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the regular Army in the field,'"—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof—

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): I propose to support the Amendment put forward by my right hon. friend. It would be a very great pleasure to me and to many other hon. Members on this side of the House if we could accede to the appeal made yesterday by the hon. and gallant Member for Monmouthshire. I can truly say that upon naval and military questions I have never taken Party line; but the hon. and gallant Gentleman, in the circumstances, asks a little too much. I should like to recall to him the circumstances of the case under which he makes this appeal. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said most truly that the Secretary for War had in all his dealings with the Opposition shown invariable courtesy. This I fully recognise; but courtesy is not all that is desired. The right hon. Gentleman has accompanied that courtesy by doing all that in him lay to destroy work done, or attempted, by some of us on this side of the House. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs very properly, I daresay from his own point of view, drew a picture, or rather made suggestions, as to what the Secretary for War might have said regarding the iniquities and infirmities of his predecessors. I am not going to dwell upon that. But what I want to point out is that this is part of the regular stage background upon which this Bill is introduced. It is part of the business to show that order has been restored where chaos was found. It was represented that the right hon. Gentleman found the Army in a state of chaos and dissolution and that he has come forth as its saviour aud restored it to its pristine virtue. The fact is, however, that the right hon. Gentleman himself has borne testimony to the condition of the Army as never having been so good as when he took office. I venture to assert that there is not an officer who will not say that two years ago the Army was better manned, better armed, better trained, better equipped, than it had ever been before. The Volunteers two years ago had 175,000 men in camp, and if the right hon. Gentleman had not interfered they would eighteen months ago have been doing exactly that which he is now hoping they will do in the future; they would have been enjoying the advantage of a fortnight in camp, and the experiment with regard to Volunteer Artillery would not be a question for the future, but a matter of experience to look back upon. I only say these things because I am anxious to dissipate the idea that there has been a waving of the wand by which the reign of order has replaced a state of chaos.

The Secretary for War appealed for plenty of time, free from criticism and interference, wherein to formulate his policy, and everybody on this side of the House felt that it was a fair appeal, and it was responded to. But what has happened? Eighteen months have passed and we have had speeches innumerable from the right hon. Gentleman—the air has been ringing with his eloquence. What has been done? Absolutely nothing at all, except that a large part of the Army has been rendered less effective for war. The Romans, when they wished to inflict a disabling blow coupled with indelible disgrace upon an enemy, used to practise decimation, and the right hon. Gentleman has very nearly succeeded in decimating the Regular Army; already he has succeeded in knocking 20,000 men off the Regular force. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] I am glad to have the accuracy of this statement confirmed. That, we are told, is a beginning only; and when I speak of the Regular Army I mean men serving with the colours only. I can quite understand that there are some who think this a meritorious act, but it does not go far towards strengthening the Army. What I wish to point out is that, so far as accomplishment goes, there has been nothing but destruction, nothing in the way of construction but promises, hopes, and anticipations in regard to the future.

My objections to the Bill can be summed up in a very few words; I believe it involves a policy of make-believe from beginning to end—a make-believe of which the real authors are very well aware. The Secretary of State astonished some of us when he told the House that he had not been able yet to ascertain what were the real military needs of the Empire. I think that was rather an astonishing statement, for I thought we had during the last five or six years made some progress towards arriving at a conclusion upon this all-important matter, and it causes a shock now to find proposals made without any calculation, any hypothesis, arrived at upon this all-important question. Some of us at any rate had formulated ideas on the subject. We thought—rightly or wrongly—that the principal duties of the Government in relation to the two great services were to furnish a Navy beyond challenge, to provide an Army capable of fighting abroad, to provide a striking force to move prior to mobilisation to create a great power of expansion, and in addition we thought it was necessary, even after taking into consideration the strength of the Navy, to have an efficient force to meet and defeat any raid that might be made on the shores of this country. Now, it is only the last of the requirements that the right hon. Gentleman has attempted to fulfil. Fortunately, the Navy is outside the right hon. Gentleman's dispensation; but when we come to the expeditionary force, I venture to suggest that the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division may set their minds at rest. They need not be in the least alarmed at the prospect of a gigantic expeditionary force of 160,000 men; it is but a spectral force, it does not exist, and will not exist, and nothing the House is asked to do will call it into existence; it is no more a reality than the spectral force that "beleaguered the walls of Prague." I do not believe that the formation of such a force is a prime necessity of our military constitution, but I do believe the power to keep such a force in the field by expansion by trained men is a military necessity of the first order. In this matter the right hon. Baronet may possess his soul in peace, because this is a visionary force which has no existence now, and, as far as anything the House is going to be asked to do, is not to have any existence whatever in the future.

I will not trouble the House with any reference to the striking force. It is condemned by every military authority with whom I have discussed it. The striking force of 5,000 sixpenny Reservists has been condemned by every soldier I know of.

Some words fell from the Financial Secretary to the War Office last night that require notice. The Bill, he said—and I think he said it with the wisdom of the serpent—was exclusively concerned with what have hitherto been called the Auxiliary Forces. That is exactly what the right hon. Gentleman wants the House and the country to think, and if that were all, the interest I take in the Bill would be very different from what it is. So far as the Auxiliary Forces go the Bill practically makes no difference at all. When all is said and done, and if the Bill passed to-morrow, the difference would be so slight as to be scarcely observable. But the Bill touches greatly, intimately, and most dangerously, not the Regular Forces only, but the *quasi*-Regular Forces which hitherto have supported the Army in the field. I do not wonder that the Financial Secretary was anxious to divert attention from that aspect of the Bill; but I am anxious that attention should be called to it because it is a most important question. For 840 years this country has been fighting year in and year out abroad. The bones of British soldiers lie in every land from the shores of the Baltic to Torres Strait, from Pekin to the Red River. There is only one part of the world's surface where such relics of war are not to be found, and that is the soil of England. Have we no right to learn something from the history of the past? That history tells us that whereas we have had, in order to build up our Empire and to safeguard and protect our industries, to sacrifice blood and treasure in every part of the inhabited world except this England in which we live, we have never yet had to undertake a serious war to repel an invasion of this country. The conclusion I draw from this fact is the simple one that as things have been, so it is probable they will remain. The high probability is that the lessons of the past will serve us in framing our anticipations of the future; and I believe that if ever there was a time when we were justified in forming that conclusion it is the present time, when we have done so much to strengthen our power at sea. At any rate I think I am not unreasonable in asking hon. Members to attach importance first of all to that weapon on which alone we have ever had to rely in the whole of our long history. It is that weapon which the right hon. Gentleman is trying to blunt, but which I desire to keep clear and bright for all emergencies. That weapon is being blunted to an extent which the country does not appreciate at all, and much of that process is to be effected within the four corners of this Bill. The right hon.

Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said—and with much that he said on this point I agree—that what we want in order to reinforce the Army in time of war is *cadres*. How is it that when we want *cadres* our first effort is to destroy ten of the units we already possess? The Government know perfectly well where the real *crux* of this question lies, and that is why they have been so very careful to cover up their tracks, if I may use that expression. It is absolutely wrong to say, as was said by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, that fewer recruits will be required under the new policy. It has been stated that under the previous arrangement 31,000 recruits have been required for the Infantry, 12,000 for long-service, and 19,000 for short-service. How many are required now? You require 22,000 long-service recruits and 13,000 short-service recruits, or 35,000 altogether under the new system. The right hon. Gentleman has told us we are going to have a stronger Reserve than we have ever had; and in order to make people accept that statement he has taken a very strong course indeed. It was necessary that he should try to create that impression. He has destroyed or is destroying the Militia, which with all its faults, and they are many, has at any rate done something to give us a substitute for a Reserve, and has set free Regular troops in time of war. He has reduced the number of *cadres*, the artillery, and the establishment of the *cadres*, and therefore it is natural to suppose that the available force after these reductions will be less than it was before. In order to dissipate that very natural belief, he has given the House the Return entitled "Army Reserve, Actuarial Calculation of the Normal Strength," etc. I challenge that Return. I say that it is not worth the paper it is printed on. Every line of it is calculated to mislead, and has misled. *Prima facie* the Return is absurd. What does it start out to prove? We have diminished the Army by ten *cadres* of infantry; we have reduced every battalion of infantry by eighty men as compared with 1890, by thirty men as compared with last year.

MR. HALDANE: Establishment?

MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to make a distinction between establishment and strength? If so, he will make his case worse, not better. After the reductions made and the increase of the term of service for the whole Army, the right hon. Gentleman asks us to believe that the Reserve will not only be as great, but greater than it was before. How carelessly these things are presented to the House! My right hon. friend the Member for Dover asked the natural question how is it, if this reduced establishment is to produce this large Reserve, that even now, after a long period of enlistment for short-service, we have a smaller number of men? We are told that we are to have a Reserve of 115,000 men, recently magnified to 121,000 by some stroke of the pen, and my right hon. friend asked how was it that now we had only got 113,000 men. The right hon. Gentleman said that the explanation was that fourteen recently created battalions have not produced their normal reserve. As a matter of fact these battalions have all been in existence for seven or eight years, and under normal conditions they would have produced their seven years reserve. But the conditions were not normal. During five of these years there have been men pouring into the Reserve on a three and even on a two years enlistment. But there is a much stronger point than that. The regiments have produced much more than their usual reserve, and it would have been well if the right hon. Gentleman had looked at the Return before making his explanation. The Return shows that so far from there being a falling off in the Infantry Reserve, the Infantry Reserve is now 7,000 men more than the calculated Infantry Reserve under the new scheme. And yet he coolly accounts for the number of the Reserve by this imaginary diminution. There will be a great diminution in the calculated Infantry Reserve. I have gone through this Return and others have gone through it also, and I venture to state that if we were to say that we shall get 90,000 men as the available Reserve product of this new scheme we should be very much nearer the mark than this figure of 115,000. The whole of this calculation has been deduced, not from strength, but from establishment. The right hon. Gentleman has told us himself that this year there are 9,000 more men going out of the Army than coming into it. And next year there will be 13,000 more going out than will come in. I want to know the right hon. Gentleman's authority for his calculations.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (MR. HALDANE, Haddington): The right hon. Gentleman asks me a question. The authorities were the best actuaries at the War Office. The Return have been prepared on the most skilled advice.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Very well, the right hon. Gentleman says his calculations are based on the most skilled advice. I have in my hand a Return drawn up two years ago in the War Office for the information of the Army Council, and I should like to tell the right hon. Gentleman under what conditions the Return was drawn up. The question was asked what would be the normal Reserve of the Army on a given establishment. At that time the Army was larger by eight battalions than it is now, every battalion having a larger establishment of strength than is the case at present. What was the result? That larger establishment and larger number of battalions was there stated to give a Reserve of 7,000 less than the Reserve of the right hon. Gentleman. I look upon this actuarial calculation, and I see the name of "J. G. Ashley," the identical actuary whom the right hon. Gentleman claims as supporting this Return.

*MR. HALDANE: Nine years and three are the terms of enlistment.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is one of the casual interruptions of the Secretary of State for War. He is in error. The question answered in the Return to which I have referred is "What, with a system of seven years enlistment, will be the number of men in the home battalions unavailable on mobilisation, and what numbers will be available from the Reserve?"

*MR. HALDANE: The home battalions?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The right hon. Gentleman need not interrupt me. Given an establishment for home battalions of 750, the strength of the Reserve is shown in the answer as for sections A and B, 40,000 in round numbers, and for section D, 15,000, total 55,000, the establishments being fifty-two battalions in India, twenty-five in the Colonies, and seventy-nine battalions at home of 800 non-commissioned officers and men. There is no getting out of that.

*MR. HALDANE: Seventy-nine battalions?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, eight more than we have got now. I challenge this Return, it is impossible to have this Reserve. And I will go further. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that we are to have an additional Reserve for the Regular Army. I want the House to understand exactly what this additional Reserve is going to be. It is to be made up of boys now going into the Militia, boys who enlist at seventeen. They are to have six months training in the depot, they are to get 6d. a day in their pockets, and at the end of one year, or two years, or two and a half years, they are to be brought back and made the first-class Reservists of the British Army. I have seen these boys, and if I could take hon. Members down and show them these boys, as I have seen them, stopped in their gymnastic rounds because they had not the strength to go through them, I think we should not hear so much of this great addition to the strength of the British Army. Two out of every three of these boys are useless; they fall by the wayside and die out. The remaining one survives; he goes campaigning in India; he bivouacks; he is fed, and clothed and he survives, and at the end of seven years becomes a Reservist. I saw the Devon Regiment mobilised for the South African war. It consisted of 1,000 men, 500 of whom were Reservists. They occupied, I am told, more lateral space than any other battalion in the British Army. There was not a man who did not know his colonel, his officers and his non-commissioned officers. Such are the present Reservists of the British Army. What is the substitute? These boys, cast adrift at seventeen and a half, and for a year in nearly all cases, and in some cases for two years, absolutely useless either to God or man. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] Well, I withdraw that remark; I used the expression colloquially. But, at any rate, for any military purpose these boys are useless. They cannot be called out for service at home and they are not allowed to be used for service abroad; but at the end of two-and-a-half years they will be called out as first-class Reservists of the British Army. I read lately an article—I do not speak as to the accuracy of it, but I can testify to the ability of the writer—in which it was stated that we are not to be discouraged because the second line of the Army is not equal to the first, and the writer said: "No second line can take the field. Look at the second line of the German Army." The House is often misled on this subject. The second line of the German Army is composed of men of thirty-five years of age and upwards. Every one of them serves two years under the most severe discipline in the world, is commanded by officers of immense experience, and is utilised, if necessary, in that enormous chain of fortresses which rings the German Empire. Is it reasonable, is it common sense to compare these men with such a second line as this of the right hon. Gentleman? I say it is not.

Then there is the utter failure to provide for the great want of the Army—that is officers. Here I must complain again that the House is not properly informed. We were told that officers were to be taken from the public schools and the Universities. We were told that these young gentleman from the Univerities were everything that was to be desired, because they were to be trained on the same method as that in use in the German Army and were attached *a la suite* of a regiment. The House thought that was a very good thing; but let me explain where the analogy fails. If these boys have served in their public school corps—not a very high form of training, I think—four months are to be knocked off; if they joined their University corps, four months more are to be knocked off, and they are to be attached to a line battalion and to be *a la suite* for four months only. They will mess with the battalion and try very hard to do somebody else's work while somebody else tries to prevent them from doing it. The second line of the German Army is officered to a considerable extent by men who have been *a la suite* of a regiment. If a boy passes his final examination in the schools and shows educational and social qualifications, he is permitted, as a one year volunteer, to join a regiment. The only thing to distinguish him is that he wears a white thread in his collar and is allowed to live in lodgings. At the end of the year, if physically, socially, and intellectually fit, he is permitted to serve one year *a la suite* of a regiment as a subaltern officer, under the sternest discipline the world affords, and at the end of that time, if still regarded as qualified, he is permitted to serve as Under-Lieutenant in the Landwehr. And some German papers complain that officers with that amount of training and discipline are inadequate for the purpose for which they are required, and are trying to get a better class of officer. A comparison of that kind is absolutely unmeaning and illusory. His hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abercromby Division always reminds me of Sir Walter Scott or George Eliot, who, whenever they wanted to find a chapter heading, wrote a verse themselves and ascribed it to an "old song." Whenever my hon. and gallant friend finds it difficult to enforce an argument, he always invents an old song or a new song to illustrate it. He told the House yesterday that all officers of Continental armies were raised from the ranks.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I said they had served in the ranks.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As a matter of fact, in France some officers are promoted from the ranks because, very much to the regret of the authorities, they have not been able to provide sufficient officers from the military colleges. But in Germany, no officer serves in the ranks, he has to be balloted for before he is taken, and even those who do pass a year in the ranks under the circumstances I have described, are not taken for the Regular Army, but for the Landwehr. I think we must, therefore, pause and ask ourselves whether we are really supplying the fighting line with competent officers.

I will not deal with the question of the Yeomanry. My impression is that the Government will be well advised to give way on that point, and I trust they will do so. But I would like to touch on the question of the Volunteer Force, which I admit I consider a subsidiary question. In the first place, it is not the Army that is going to fight our battles. It never has done so, and I do not believe it ever will; but, be that as it may, I do not trouble myself very much on that matter, for I believe that when the Bill has passed, if it does pass, there will be no difference whatever between the Volunteers as they are now and as they will be then. With regard to what I may call the penal clauses, I do not think my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Sheffield need trouble about them. They are rather like the famous punishment in which the penalty is death or a 5s. fine, and you need not pay the fine unless you like." It is my impression that the right hon. Gentleman will relax those penalties and that the Volunteers will go on very much as they do now. They will have, it is true, the advantage of being organised and looked after by a miscellaneous body, the structure of which has not yet been defined; but I would remind the House that at the only time our Forces were in the hands of local authorities they were worse conducted and there was more corruption and failure than at any other time. That is an historical fact. I admit, however, that I do not anticipate such a state of things under modern conditions. I only hope that when the Volunteers come under the Lord-Lieutenant and the county council and the rest of the *omnium gatherum* proposed, they will be very much improved; but, as far as I can see, there will not be any change at all, except that they will be reduced in numbers.

It is part of the scheme, as I understand it, that the Volunteers shall, if necessary, go out as units in case of war. My hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abercromby Division gave the House a little lecture yesterday on voluntary service, but there was no truth in it at all.

MAJOR SEELY: The point I endeavoured to make was that, in point of fact, when you have forced men to serve in your home Army, you find it difficult to get them to serve abroad.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: On that point I absolutely and entirely agree with the hon. and gallant Member, but I think he did very much dwell upon the question of whether good work would be done by men serving under compulsion. But as a matter of fact all men serve under compulsion. In this Bill compulsion is provided for. Every single one of these men who is still serving in the Force when a war takes place is compelled to serve for one year or for the duration of the war. It is quite certain that unless we have some compulsion of that kind we get no service at all. It is a dream to imagine that we can get service without compulsion in this sense. During the war in America between the North and South—a National cause if ever there was one—what happened? The men who had joined for six months went away the moment they got their liberty, and President Lincoln had to use his immense influence to put the law in correspondence with the circumstances and bring back these men or keep them where they were.

The Swiss Army has been held up as an example for our imitation and as bearing in some way on this Bill. But are we going to have the Swiss system? Nothing the least like it. If the Swiss system is good, our system is very bad. The Swiss Army is a conscript Army. The hon. and gallant Member has told the House that it is only called out for repetition courses every other year. That was so, but the Swiss Government found that that did not give a sufficient military education, and they changed it, and the men have now to come out every year.

MAJOR SEELY: No; not last year certainly.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon. and gallant Member is perfectly right; but the arrangement was found so unsatisfactory that the law has been altered. Let me compare the training of the Swiss Army with that of the Territorial Force. The Swiss preliminary training for infantry is sixty-five days, but the preliminary training of the men of the Territorial Force is eight to fourteen, and forty drills; for the cavalry the Swiss training is ninety days against our fourteen, and for the artillery seventy-five days against our eight to fourteen. The period of service in the Swiss Army is eight years, and the total number of days training is, for a private, 164 days, while the equivalent period in our Army is forty-eight.

For the non-commissioned officers the period of training is 164 days plus 103 days for special instruction, a total of 267 days. In the case of officers, a lieutenant has to serve for 431 days in addition to his annual trainings. The repetition courses are in the infantry eleven days annually, and in the artillery fourteen. It is a pity, I think, that my hon. and gallant friend did not draw attention to these facts when he held up the Swiss as an example for our imitation. The Secretary for War recently took the chair when a Paper was read on the Swiss Army by an officer of Volunteers. I wonder the right hon. Gentleman was not tempted to set the lecturer right. The latter admitted that he knew that the Swiss Army was not thought much of by the German War Office, and, in order to get out of that difficulty, he said the Germans have apparently only lately discovered that it was owing to their adopting the Militia system, that they succeeded in saving their country and making it what it is. There again is an example of how people are misled. What was this Prussian Militia system adopted after the battle of Jena? In one day, the audience were told, the Prussian Army was swept away by an Army on a Militia basis. What was the Army on the Militia basis? The Army of Bonaparte in 1806, I suppose the most professional Army that ever trod shoe-leather or carried a bayonet. Then it was said that they were beaten in the long run by the Prussian Militia system. The Prussian Militia system was compulsion on every man in Prussia who could bear a gun to serve for three years in the Army. If that is the idea of Militia service, we are a very long way off it in this country. But I can excuse the lecturer when I consider the point of view from which he approached the subject. He said that in Switzerland they were not cursed with the Blue Water school. Can the depth of folly and ignorance go further? What is the Blue Water School? It is the product of the study of our great sailors who have preserved this country inviolate through many generations, and who believe they have accumulated a store of military and naval knowledge which is worth placing at the disposal of their country. That a British officer should be silly enough in the presence of the Secretary for War to praise and hold up for admiration the organisation of an Army because the people of that country are not cursed with a Blue Water school is a strange departure from propriety—I will not say from sanity.

Are we really going to provide for the expansion of the Army by Volunteers? I do not think we are, or that in his heart the right hon. Gentleman thinks we are. As to the number of Volunteers on the outbreak of war, I would draw attention to what was said by the authorities questioned on this matter by the War Commission. The Inspector-General of Recruiting said—

> "The number of Volunteer companies at first required were obtained with the greatest ease. The second drafts required to replace these in the spring of 1901 were obtained with more difficulty, and, indeed, not obtained in sufficient numbers; and it was found to be impossible on a later attempt to obtain at all an adequate number. The Volunteers obtained on the last call in the autumn of 1901 only amounted to 2,413 as against 10,500 obtained on the first call."

What was the reason? There is some testimony on this point. The hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield asked why the Volunteer ceased to come, and he said the reason was that the Yeomanry were getting 5s. a day without qualification and service companies 1s. a day with a very high qualification; also that the great war fever had passed away. The Inspector-General of Recruiting also said that—

> "The Volunteer private did not see why he should go out for 1s. a day in the Volunteer service companies when he could go out for 5s. as a Yeoman."

That is a reason, but it does not quite fit in with the case which it is desired to make. It is true, moreover, that war fevers do arise and pass away. I make no charge against the Volunteers. Men do not go to war for the picnic anywhere. But the whole organisation of the Volunteers is on a basis which makes it improbable that they will give the necessary service. Let the matter be put to the test. If the Secretary of State will ask the Volunteer commanding officers to get a statement from the men serving as to how many of them are willing during the next twelve months to go to any war which may break out, he will get some idea as to what it is he is really counting upon. Why this should not be done I am at a loss to understand.

The whole organisation of the Volunteers shows that they are not intended to supply units for a war abroad; we are driven back, and shall always be driven back, on the Reserve we have prepared for the Regular Army. Lastly, I want to say a word about the artillery. We are living in a perfect fools' paradise as regards this subject. The right hon. Gentleman has been acquitted of any attempt to mislead the House in the answer he gave to a question regarding the new guns, but the answer could scarcely have been different if it had been deliberately designed to mislead. The answer was one from which any human being would have carried away the impression that the guns in question were first-class guns, equal, if not superior, to the guns of foreign Powers. If our gunners were in action against foreign troops and were armed only with this gun, they would simply be destroyed 1,500 yards before they got into action. I do not know whether the cumulative effect of what I have said has produced on others an impression like that which I am under myself. My impression is that we are playing with these problems; we are not really taking the matter seriously at all. We are not following the example of Switzerland or of any other country. We are pretending that we can achieve our objects with practically no training and under conditions which are not those which make soldiers, or under which anybody has ever succeeded in dealing with such a problem. I am not one of those who believe the right hon. Gentleman will not get his Territorial Army. I do not see why he should not get it. He has the Volunteers now, even if he is going to leave them exactly as they are. What I want to know is, has the right hon. Gentleman got an Army, or when the right hon. Gentleman has got the men, can it be reasonably supposed that he will get an Army which will uphold the honour and preserve the safety of this country in time of war? Although a great deal can be done by good will, we must have also discipline and confidence. There are Members of this House who know very well by experience what I and many others only know by reading—they know perfectly well that when a man is called upon to face death, and it becomes a question as to whether he ought to go forward, to go back or to remain where he is at the risk of his life, everything depends upon association with his officers, confidence in his comrades, and, however irksome it may be, upon discipline. Shall we create men in the Territorial Army like the men of the 10th Legion, or the Old Guard, or the men of the Light Division? Are you preparing an Army for that day of trial, to stand the tremendous pressure upon the human organism and the human spirit that was imposed by intimate contact with the sight and fear of death? Because if you are not, all these fine words and speeches are not worth anything at all. You may point to your Army and your county associations and say "Look at our success." You may have 300,000 men playing about with guns, and organised in brigades and divisions, and say that is success. But that is not the real test. The ultimate test, the only serious test of whether you have an Army at all is the test of the day of battle. I venture to hope hon. Members on this side of the House and some hon. Members on the other side of the House will ask themselves whether we are preparing to meet that test; whether it is in accordance with the universal teaching of all time that we shall postpone our preparations for war until the enemy is at our gates; whether it is in accordance with the teaching of this and all other ages that we should provide inferior troops with inferior officers, and whether it be in accordance with that teaching that we should be the one isolated example of that departure from the accepted doctrine of every other country in the world. Do we believe that we can do without effort, without sacrifice, without science, and without expense, that which other countries with all these things have found it difficult to accomplish? For all these reasons I cordially support the Amendment of my right hon. friend.

*MR. ACLAND (Yorkshire, Richmond) said the House would hardly expect him to enter into and answer the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. The House had been told many things and had heard many strong expressions. They had been told that every speaker from the Government benches on Army matters was wrong, and that nothing had been done by anybody since the Government had come into office; that their Returns were worthless; that the House had been misled by the phrases used and, once or twice that no truth at all had been uttered by Members on those benches. That was such strong language that he did not dare to imitate it. There was, however, one question which struck him as important, bearing in mind what had already taken place. Surely ex-Ministers for War could not make any great claim to have left the Army in a satisfactory condition, while at the same time attacking violently and mercilessly the schemes that had been brought before the House for improving the condition of the Army as left by them. The question, for instance, which, the House had to ask itself about the training of officers by the scheme now under consideration was not whether it was an ideal scheme which would give the officers as much training as they would like them to have, but whether it was not a great improvement upon anything that was done, or intended to be done, by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The right hon. Gentleman left the Army short of 4,000 officers, and surely he could not go on and denounce the effort which was now being made to get rid of that grave danger and produce a better state of things. With regard to the Reserves there was the actuarial question, and the general question. Their actuarial Return had been attacked. It would be defended and justified at the proper time. But on the general question he could reply at once. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think there was to be some change in the system of supplying Reserves for the Regular Army. He had mentioned the second battalion of the Devon regiment in order to allege that the system which produced that battalion was being done away with. There would be no such change. The special contingent was intended to supply drafts; they did not take the place of the men who filled up the Reserve, which was secured to bring up the battalions to their full strength. The filling up of the battalions would go on in exactly the same way as before. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had attacked the proposed organisation in two portions, professional and non-professional, and complained that it was not as suited to our needs as a system of three lines of support. That suggestion had been supported in a leading article in *The Times*. But the argument for it entirely broke down when examined, for it was found that the second line was said to be required for two purposes—providing drafts and also serving in complete units. These two different things could not be done by the same force, and therefore, as drafts were essential, a draft providing force had to be set up separately. There would then be, according to the right hon. Gentleman, apart from this force, a second line which must be either professional or non-professional But if the second line was a professional force, when war came it would compete with the Regular Army for the same class of recruits. On the other hand, if the second and third lines were non-professional forces, they would compete with the Volunteers. It was far better to have a professional force with a complete system of drafts on one side, and a non-professional force on a uniform basis on the other, than to have successive supports under different systems and different organisations. The question was whether, in a time of national disaster, when our professional resources had been exhausted, and it was necessary to call upon the nation for help, we should have time to train and complete our force before it left this country. If organisation was provided—and he believed it could be provided in the best possible way by having a home force organised in one system—we could devote all our attention to training, and we should be in a much better position to send out a great force to bear the burden cast upon our shoulders. The right hon. Gentleman had also spoken of the practical and the problematical side of the Government scheme, and had made much of the point that if the practical side, or Field Force, succeeded, the problematical side, or Home Force, must fail. That would have been true if he had applied it to the Militia in the past, for if the Militia had succeeded in doing its duty to the Regular line, namely, by supplying them with recruits in time of peace and drafts in time of war, it was fairly certain that they would have failed to perform the other part of their task, that of expansion. Surely, however, it was one of the great benefits of this new plan that it enabled the two things to be kept distinct; it enabled the Regular line to do its work with its drafts provided for it, and did not interfere with the Home Force. He understood that it was one of the chief aims of the scheme to separate the professional from the non-professional side of our national forces, in order to ensure that the success of the one might be entirely independent of the success of the other, and in order, too, that they might complete the Regular Army and keep it up to the full strength without interfering with the Home Force at all. He might comment upon one point raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, who had very much blamed, as he understood, the Secretary for War for having confessed that there was no strategical reason at the bottom of the fixing the expeditionary force at a certain number.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he had not blamed the Secretary for War, but the right hon. Gentleman had said that it was an accident that the number was fixed at what it was. He had said that in his opinion the number was too large, and that he agreed with the Leader of the Opposition as to that.

*Mr. ACLAND said that then perhaps he was in agreement with the right hon. Baronet in saying that there was no reason in the nature of things why this particular force should be kept at that particular number. What he meant was that, although it was considered necessary to maintain that force at present at a certain number of battalions, for certain purposes, in certain parts of the world, yet, when we had got, in the next few or many years, a power of expansion outside our professional force, and when our prospective relations with foreign countries admitted of it, then we might safely cut off some of those triplets of battalions which the right hon. Baronet mentioned. [Ironical Opposition cheers.]

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Subject, of course, to the quality of the short-service troops at home.

*Mr. ACLAND said he ought, in answer to the jeers from the other side, to say that he was simply expressing his own opinion and his own hopes for the future, and he hoped the opinion of many of those behind him. With regard to the vexed question of the adjutants, he might say that what was intended, or what was hoped, was more perhaps an ideal of the General Staff to which the battalions might be educated than anything which it was intended to rush upon them whether they liked it or not.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Is the hon. Gentleman speaking for the Government, or giving his own opinion?

*Mr. ACLAND said in this case he believed he was speaking for the Government.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: It is just as well we should know.

*Mr. ACLAND said he thought it might be understood that that idea of the General Staff was based upon good reasons. It was based upon the main idea which had dictated so many of the improvements and modifications made since the war, on the distinction between command and training on the one side and administration on the other. There was no expectation that, in the Territorial Army, the adjutants would do the whole of the work now done by the Regular adjutants. It was rather intended that they should do the clerical work which was now done by the Regular adjutants, and that the work of training should be done from outside. It was believed that they would get better results if they had instructors from outside rather than adjutants from the inside. He was sure that many battalions would be glad to have their orderly room work done by one of their own officers, and to have the whole machinery of training external to the battalion itself, and not done by one of the officers of the battalion. Of course, all battalions were not ready for that, but he was glad to know that there were many battalions which believed that the system was perfectly practicable.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: Can you name one of them?

*Mr. ACLAND gave as an example the Lanark Artillery Volunteers. On the question of cost it was stated in the Memorandum that the matter of allowances was not absolutely settled. When they came to the figures they found what would be received by an ordinary trooper of the Yeomanry at present and under the new scheme. Assuming, for the sake of argument only, that 1s. a day was given for the messing allowance, then the figures were these. The trooper would get under the new scheme 10s. 8d. a day for fifteen days, while under the old scheme he would receive 10s. 9d. for eighteen days. Surely, that was not a very great difference, and surely they would not have the Yeomanry entirely destroyed owing to a small change of that sort. It would be seen by the noble Lord the Member for the City of Oxford that the sum of 10s. 8d. a day for fifteen days was very considerably in excess of the 7s. a day, which, as had been truly said, it now cost to keep man and horse. With regard to the officers of infantry, and in reference to the question asked by the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone, it might be interesting to compare the allowance which would be received by the ordinary captain of infantry of the Home Force in the future with what he received now. In future he would receive 19s. 8½d. a day as compared with 8s. at present. Surely that was a very considerable improvement, which should do a great deal to encourage men to take commissions in the Territorial Army. In the case of a captain of Yeomanry, the new figure was £1 2s. 5¼d. a day compared with the old figure of £1 3s.—a loss of only 6¾d. He hoped that they would not lose the splendid Yeomanry officers they had at present for the sake of the 6¾d. a day which they might be asked to lose. Someone had said in the course of the debate that they could not afford to be patriotic in these days, but he thought that there was still a great deal of patriotism knocking about. He found, in a small way, that people were very willing to be Volunteers if only they saw that the force was encouraged and treated seriously. A man did not make strict examination as to whether the sixpence he might spend on a railway journey to attend drill would be repaid or not. He belonged to a battalion which consisted mostly of ordinary Civil Service clerks, many of them with pay no higher than that of a good many working men, and they would go, at Easter, for instance, from London to the neighbourhood of Hastings on their bicycles for four days outing, and would receive absolutely no grant at all. It cost each man 12s. 6d. for the four days, yet all were perfectly willing to pay it for a good turn out. There were thousands of similar cases throughout the country, and there was not that absolute lack of patriotism which would compel them to pay market rates for every single hour of time which they might ask a man to give up. He might say a word or two in reply to the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Sheffield, who, as a commanding officer, had a great reputation among Volunteers. Over and over again the hon. and gallant Gentleman in the course of his speech on the previous day had talked about the destruction of the Volunteers. He must know perfectly well that there was no such destruction intended at all, and he appealed to him not to talk about the destruction of Volunteers when he knew perfectly well that the word did not apply in any shape or form. The hon. and gallant Gentleman knew quite well that the conditions would be in future very much what they had been in the past. If they could make things rather more serious in connection with the Volunteers, so much the better, but there were no revolutionary conditions which could be interpreted to mean the destruction of, or even serious interference with, the Volunteers. The Bill, in many parts of it, was not new at all. Clauses had been taken which had been in Volunteer Acts before. Clauses 23 and 24, as to trial of offences and penalties, contained no new and terrible system of courts-martial for trifling offences or anything of that kind, as he rather gathered the hon. and gallant Gentleman had intended to convey on the previous day. Let them take part of Clause 24, which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had particularly mentioned. It stated—

> 'Provided that a man who has been dealt with summarily by his commanding officer shall be deemed to have been tried by a court-martial."

That was taken simply and bodily from Clause 43 of the Militia Act, and it was the legal way of conveying the fact that a man, who had been dealt with by his commanding officer, could not possibly be tried again by court-martial for the same offence, which had been washed out, and summarily dealt with. He agreed that the words were not the best that could be devised, but possibly better words could be suggested in Committee to make the point clear.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT asked, if the hon. Member contended that the clause he had read applied at the present time in any shape or form to the Volunteer force; was it not an entirely novel thing?

*MR. ACLAND said it was not a novel thing at all under the Militia Act. There was nothing in the clause which was not perfectly well known in the Auxiliary Forces at present. He thanked the House for listening to him so patiently.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that those who had followed the debates on this new scheme must have been struck with two things: (1) how very little interest was taken in the debates on the matter; and (2) how curious it was that in the House of Commons as at present constituted they were almost entirely without any expert knowledge upon military matters. In all matters affecting trade, commerce, or education, they always found in the House some great critic whose opinion had some influence with the country; but there was not in the present House of Commons one single professional soldier whose opinion carried weight outside the House. [AN HON. MEMBER: What about you?] Although he knew more about the subject than most people he did not claim to be an expert, and there was in the House little or no expert opinion on military matters which was of any practical value. There was a certain amount of trained civilian opinion, but that was not expert opinion, and the House, when considering Army discipline and treatment, would do well to recollect that they were acting without the slightest expert guidance. When this scheme was first put forward he was considerably attracted towards it, largely by the provision of the expeditionary or striking force, and what appeared to him to be the courageous treatment of some of the weak points in our present military system. He was attracted to it because he thought he recognised in it the conception of a national Army based upon a local system; but he had since altered his opinion. How did this scheme affect that part of our Army which was kept and meant for fighting, and upon which our national and Imperial existence absolutely depended? That was a vital point. First of all, he recognised that they started under this scheme with 21,000 less effective soldiers than before. He regretted that step, because he thought it was a great mistake, and unless it could be shown that there was something to make up for that loss, on that ground alone he would be inclined to condemn the scheme. He did not find any fault with what was contemplated in the first instance, but did the scheme provide what was foreshadowed? What did the scheme put forward? In the year 1906 they had 78,000 British troops in India, and 52,000 in the Colonies, or in round numbers 130,000 British troops. The new scheme undertook to maintain in fighting efficiency that number of troops in India and the Colonies, but he would make every allowance and place the number at 100,000. But the new plan also undertook to provide an expeditionary force of 167,000 men. Placing the number at 150,000 it meant that the new scheme would have to maintain, keep up, and equip with war material 250,000 men for service outside our shores. That was not an inadequate provision, and if the scheme really provided that number he would give it his blessing instead of his ban. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean and the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool, seemed to think that the striking force was too large, but he did not agree with that view, although he was aware it was held by his leader. But did this scheme really provide 250,000 men? In that total, and especially amongst the 150,000 for the expeditionary force, would be included the whole of the first-class Reserve, and he wished to know how they were going to maintain that force at full strength after it had left these shores. It was proposed to keep up this force partly with the 130,000 men who might be called non-combatants, or semi-trained men, who would have to be kept under strict discipline, or else they would have all the trouble which resulted from employing semi-trained men. If those 250,000 were actually facing the enemy what would be the annual wastage? They would be sure to require at least 25 per cent. to keep the force up to strength, and that would mean another 62,000 men annually. How did the right hon. Gentleman's scheme provide for that total? He did not think they would be able to provide 20,000 from the sources which the Regular Army had at its disposal. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to conceive the position the officers would be put in. They selected some of the best men possible for the purpose of training, and then when they could be useful for the only purpose for which soldiers existed they said, "No, we retain you at that work." It could not work, and no officer worthy of the name would remain in the service if he was not to be free to go to the front with his own regiment. He had a suggestion to make to the right hon. Gentleman for what it was worth. He could conceive that these Regular Army officers might be replaced by other officers recently in the Regular Army, whose term of service was over and who might be expected to carry on the work effectively. That was one of the points which was not in the scheme.

*Mr. HALDANE said that if war broke out, those officers might eventually be replaced by what were called Reserve officers—officers who had been in the Army and were now in the Reserve—and the four captains who belonged to the training battalion would, as had been explained, probably go to the front in command of drafts or in some other capacity.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said it was satisfactory to be able to extract explanations from the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. HALDANE: I said so before.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said it was probably his fault that he did not know, but the right hon. Gentleman would allow that in a large scheme of this sort it might sometimes be necessary for him to repeat his explanations. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had answered his point. At all events, the officers thus employed would be permitted to go with their regiments to the front, and their places would be taken by others. So far so good. But would these training battalions be able to provide men fit to take their place in the fighting line? They had got to deal, so far as he could make out, very largely with the type of soldier who used to go into the Militia regiments. The question was whether they would be able to evolve out of comparatively bad stuff a soldier able to take his place in the fighting line. He was doubtful on that point. If these training battalions were not able to provide enough men, on his own showing the right hon. Gentleman would fall back largely on what might be provided by the new Territorial Army. That was the other source to which he looked for the maintenance of the fighting force in the field. In order to create that fighting force the right hon. Gentleman said, quite frankly, that he gave up the present system of Auxiliary Forces. The right hon. Gentleman had with reason much to say in favour of the better theory which the new scheme introduced. But they had to recollect that in practice the system he distrusted had at all events given us, though with some difficulty, a certain amount of good fighting stuff which had enabled us to win, even though victory had not been achieved so quickly as we should have liked. The right hon. Gentleman had to satisfy the House that under this scheme he would get men and officers from the Territorial Force to which he looked for the reinforcement of the Line. He had also to satisfy them that the scheme would result in such a reduction of expenditure as would make it worth while for the country to accept it as an economical and efficient system. He thought the speech of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was based upon an error. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to lay down that one of the duties of the Territorial Army was to find men for the expansion of the

Army in the field. He definitely said that by expansion he meant the addition of units to the fighting line. That was not, and it ought not to be, the function of the Territorial Army. The function of the Territorial Army was not to find units. Generals who had served in the field would state that when they asked that the strength should be maintained they wished to get it from units which they already had, and not from units with a different training and character. He believed the duty of the Territorial Army would be to find not so much units as drafts. If they asked it to find units they would be asking it to do what it could not accomplish. He had not seen in this scheme—although he could conceive that it might be brought into it—that this Territorial Force should be affiliated more closely with the Regular regiments. If the Territorial Force was to provide additional strength to the fighting line, it should be remembered that not a single man need go into the fighting line unless he chose to do so. The members of the force were not asked under the scheme to make a declaration a long time beforehand. It might happen that at the time when stress occurred they would have to ask the question whether they would or would not go, and it might be that they would not get the response which they wished. He did not think it would be a satisfactory position for the country to be in if they were dependent on the Territorial Force to make an efficient fighting line in the moment of emergency and difficulty. Surely if the scheme was to go through it would be better to have an arrangement that a certain percentage of the force should be under obligation to serve—say 200,000 out of 300,000—and upon whom they could rely at a pinch to go abroad. The right hon. Gentleman asked the Yeomanry and the Volunteers to give up a great deal of time, a large amount of pay, and also something of the peculiar position which they were proud to hold in the Auxiliary Forces. He was not quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman and his advisers recognised the extraordinary differences in the views taken of this question by the Yeomanry regiments. A few days ago he was consulting with the representatives of two distinct types of Yeomanry. One of them told him that the men of his regiment, so long as they were thoroughly well found and made comfortable in camp, did not expect or wish to take away any money in their pockets except £5 per horse. His other friend said that was exactly what his men would not do, and that unless each man was able to put into his pocket 4s. per day, however well he might mess him, he would not get one of the men to come out. It was a question whether the right hon. Gentleman would find the response which he so fondly anticipated. The Volunteers were not asked to make so much difference in their *status*, but still they were asked to sacrifice a great deal. He wondered how the theory of absolutely equal treatment was going to be carried out. Could they ask the members of the force to accept exactly the same arrangements in time of peace as to food, dress, and other matters? He doubted it, and yet the whole scheme depended for its practical result upon determinedly sticking to equality of treatment throughout; otherwise the democratic and homogeneous Army broke down before it had been created. The men in the Territorial Force, representing what the Volunteers now represented, would be men earning a considerable amount of wages, and they would be earning exceptionally large wages at the time of a threat of war or of actual war. They would belong to certain industries working at full time or extra time, and they would have not only large wages but the chance of promotion. Surely it was essential that none of these men should suffer by the fact that they gave their services to the country. Surely they ought to arrange that the men should get full compensation for the wages or the promotion they lost. The men should be trained before war was imminent. To postpone the training until war had broken out would be a mistake. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman was not practical, and he would be open to the charge of setting up a bogus force on which the country could not rely in time of danger. He knew that there was a school of thought which believed that comparatively little drill and a spirit of patriotism could make a good soldier; but old-fashioned soldiers like himself did not agree with that.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): What about the Boers?

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said he did not want to go into all the arguments about the Boer War; but he maintained that if we had had a more disciplined Army there would not have been so many disgraceful surrenders as there were in that war. If the present scheme was to stand good these men were only to be drilled after war had been declared. But who was to drill them? The right hon. Gentleman said that he would depend on Reserve officers for drilling the third battalion recruits; but that did not appear in the Bill. Nor did he see any arrangement in the measure for making musketry training effective. Again they could not rely on having efficiency of training for those recruits unless there were professional adjutants attached to each territorial regiment. It must be borne in mind that those adjutants were changed every four years and came fresh from the Regular Army with all the knowledge they had learned there. He admitted that many Volunteer officers were competent to drill their men and to command them on parade; but they were not equally competent as Regular officers to enforce discipline. They had already been told that the provision of officers was inadequate. He believed that that was so. He would not say that some officers should not be promoted from the ranks; but he doubted the wisdom of making that system universal. He thought it was the late Lord Palmerston who said that he had the greatest reliance on well trained troops under well-bred officers. Was the right hon. Gentleman sure that he would get good, real work out of the county associations? He was frightened about these county associations. Already as much work as they possibly could do was put on county gentlemen; and he confessed he saw difficulties in the composition of the county associations and the duties to be assigned to them. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean that they were to be the recruiters for the Territorial Force and to be the contractors for the supplies of that force? If so, there would be great pressure put on them to give the contracts into the hands of local tradesmen. He would not let the county associations interfere with the raising of the soldiers of the Territorial Army or with their treatment as soldiers; but when they were soldiers no longer the county associations might look after them and their wives and families. The right hon. Gentleman had received a considerable amount of support in the country for his scheme from the idea that it would lead to economy. That idea had been considerably exploded in the course of the debate; but if it was to be an economical scheme it would be a rank and hopeless failure. His contention was that it would lead to largely increased expense. It was said by some people that a cheap and effective Army could be based on an appeal to the manhood of the country for national service. That was a cheap, tawdry, and paltry pleasure to indulge in when speaking from platform in the country and arguing that the cost of the Army should be reduced. That was where democratic speakers always seemed to him to break down so hopelessly. He had tried to see what merits there were in the scheme. He admitted that there was a theoretic symmetry about it; but it was not practical. He thought that it was an imposition, and that the chief victim of that imposition was the right hon. Gentleman himself. Like many people who fell in love, the right hon. Gentleman saw nothing but perfection in it. He would have to acknowledge, however, that in many cases, he had not provided for efficiency and also that he could not get the fighting efficiency he desired at the cost he proposed. The right hon. Gentleman was, in fact, conducting an Army on Christian Science principles as expounded by Mrs. Eddy; but that would not do; and it was rather unfair to put his scheme before the country as a solution of the great problem of Army reform. Like many other old soldiers he was sick to death at all the squabbling over the Army, and he could wish that it should be taken out of the hands of the country and even of the House of Commons and put into the hands of the best military experts. Apparently, however, that could not be; and year after year they were face to face with some wretched squabble about getting economy with efficiency. That they could not get. Therefore, it was with considerable reluctance that he would have to give his support to the Amendment moved by the right hon. Member for Dover.

*MAJOR DUNNE (Walsall) said he rose to support the Second Reading of the measure now before the House. He thought that one of the most important underlying features of the Bill was that the right hon. Gentleman would by this scheme bring the different elements of the people of the country into a deeper sympathy with our military organisation. He did not think that it was understood how little sympathy there was with the military forces in this country. It was only when outbreaks of war took place that the country seemed to find out that we had an Army. Whoever, for instance, in times of peace heard of a public man making a speech from a public platform about the Army? Abroad, a state of affairs such as he had described was impossible, because in all European countries there was hardly a single family which had not a member either now serving in the military forces or who had served. Consequently the interests of the whole population were directly affected by anything which affected the efficiency or well-being of the Army. It was not so very long ago that soldiers in uniform were refused admission to certain portions of places where public entertainments were held, and if the population of the country were in sympathy with the military forces such a thing could not take place. The right hon. Gentleman, hoped, however, to bring the Army and the population into greater sympathy with each other, not by conscription, but by means of the county associations. He hoped that very great interest indeed would be aroused by carrying the principle of local self-government into the affairs of the Territorial Army, so that the Army and its efficiency would be brought more nearly home to the different sections of the population throughout the country. If that were done, a vast set forward would be given to an increase in numbers and to the general efficiency of the Territorial Army. If the scheme was to be a success, however, they must get in all those who might be interested in the subject; not only the Lord-Lieutenant and the landlord, but the farmer and the employer of labour, so that all classes of society should unite. Until they could get them to unite, he did not think the scheme would be a success. He would point out one way in which the efficiency of the Territorial Army would be increased by the appointment of these county associations. He happened to have been a staff officer of a Volunteer brigade, and he knew the difficulty that corps had in obtaining sufficient ground to manœuvre over, and therefore derive benefit from the fortnight's or week's Volunteer training which took place in each year. If, however, they could enlist the sympathies of all the landowners and farmers and of the other people whose land was wanted to practise upon, he thought a great step would then have been taken to increase the efficiency and the value of the Volunteer training, whether it was eight days or a fortnight, or whatever it might be, short or long. Therefore he thought that not only would they gain in efficiency by setting up these associations, but they would bring the civil population into closer sympathy with the needs and requirements of the Territorial Army. On the 28th February last, the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil said, that—

> "His personal feeling was one of strong suspicion that by this scheme they would strengthen the military spirit and thereby increase the risk of war."

He thought it was an established fact now that the risk of war was certainly not increased by universal service. He was not advocating for one moment the question of universal service, but by bringing home the responsibility to each man of knowing what fighting meant he certainly thought they did not run the risk of anything in the shape of an aggressive policy, and that if many of those who shouted themselves hoarse on Mafeking night had known that there was any probability of their being called upon to make their words good, the country would have evinced a more sober spirit on that occasion. It was an established fact that in all countries where conscription and universal service were enforced it had a distinctly sobering effect upon the warlike spirit of the country. The only exception that he could think of would be that of an entirely autocratic empire where they had a standing army at the call of a despot. That might, of course, lead to an aggressive policy, but in countries under freer institutions that would not be so. "Defence not defiance," was the present motto of the Volunteer Force, and he was sure that that motto would be quite applicable to the new Territorial Army which it was proposed to set up under this scheme. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil also said on the same occasion in regard to a proposal to look after Reservists and discharged soldiers, which was one of the functions put upon these county associations, that—

> "He protested against the present tendency to give preferential treatment in the matter of employment to men who had served in the Army."

He maintained that nothing that they could do for men who had been in the Army and who were either Reservists or discharged soldiers could be looked upon as preferential. These men had volunteered to give seven years of their lives at that period of all others when it was most important for them to start a career, and the work of the various associations now existing was to make up to them the long start that the rest of their fellow workmen had obtained in setting themselves up in life and in qualifying themselves for the various professions and employments in which they engaged. Our soldiers had lost seven years in the race of life, and all they asked was that these associations should make up to them the loss of those valuable seven years. The term "preferential employment" was not, he thought, a correct term to apply to the small aid which was and would be afforded to our discharged soldiers and Reservists. He would like in conclusion to say one word upon what he thought might possibly be the effect of this Bill on the numbers of the Territorial Army. He thought the immediate effect would probably be that the present number of the Auxiliary Forces would be reduced on account of the six months training when embodiment occurred. On the calling out of the Regular Army when war broke out certain trades were extremely active, especially those engaged on Government contracts. In the case of large engineering firms like Armstrong's, which had a battalion of Volunteers formed of their employees, it stood to reason that the majority of those men would be among the most active and keenest workers in the firm, and the effect of this proposal would be that the employers would be rather inclined to discourage their men from joining Volunteer battalions connected with their own works. In order to meet that difficulty there would have to be great elasticity and great differentiation between the calling out of the different forces, both as regarded locality, the units, and also the men. He thought, moreover, that men employed on the active service of keeping troops supplied with the necessities of war were serving their country equally satisfactorily with the man who went and did six months training and shoudered a rifle when called upon. Therefore, no stigma of not having fulfilled his patriotic duty should be cast upon one who did not leave his business, in order to enable the Government to furnish the materials of war.

*Mr. J. WARD, referring to the remark of the right hon. Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire that there were no great military experts in the House, and that it would be much better if the military experts were given an opportunity of entirely deciding technical questions of this kind, supposed the right hon. Gentleman would agree that one could easily get military experts of equal standing who would give equally important declarations in favour of the scheme and against it. It was not a question for military experts, it was a question whether the attempted reorganisation appeared from a common sense point of view to be better than the system of organisation which prevailed at the present time. He did not suppose that whatever was said by Labour Members would prevent the Bill becoming law, and he warned hon. Members with whom he was closely associated not to deprive themselves, by open hostility at the commencement of the debate, of the right to attempt to mould the Bill in a democratic direction. There might be many things said in favour of the proposals even from their point of view. He was an advocate of peace and did not believe in war as a means of settling international disputes. He wanted to see a reduction in the cost of our standing Army, and he saw nothing in the Bill to prevent him pressing the War Minister in that direction. Reference had been made to the suggested increase of the striking force. He thought the Bill had nothing to do with the striking force at all, and therefore the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean on the previous day, when he had attempted to enlist the hostility of the Labour Members against the Bill on the ground that it was to increase the standing Army, had not much force. He had read the Bill carefully and he saw no such suggestion in its clauses. There might be that idea at the back of the minds of the gentlemen who advocated it, but the House of Commons would be able to defeat their proposals when they were brought forward absolutely independently of the scheme contained in the Bill. This was a Bill to codify and unify the organisation of the voluntary forces for home defence, and he thought the Bill and its proposals would be just as necessary with a striking force of 67,000 as with a striking force of 167,000. The first thing they had to do before they proceeded to reduce the standing Army or the striking force was to perfect and unify as far as they could the Auxiliary Forces on which they had to rely for home defence. Therefore, the scheme, instead of preventing a reduction of the cost of the standing Army, would, in his opinion, greatly assist economists in the future in attempting legitimately and properly to effect such reduction. He was not alone in that view. The criticisms of the late War Secretary indicated that he held a similar view, and as the right hon. Gentleman was a military expert of renown he (Mr. Ward) was in good company. It must not be taken that all supporters of the Bill favoured a large increase. He thought it would be quite possible to support the Bill and still to ask for a reduction of the standing Army. He was compelled, however, to make one or two important criticisms which were of such a character that he would have to vote against the Third Reading of the Bill if some alteration were not made in it. The fostering of the military spirit among the boys of our schools vitiated the whole principle of the Bill. They ought surely to be able to rely on grown men to defend the country in time of war, and in time to come he thought they would find plenty of men for that purpose. With all due deference to the ex-Minister for War, he also thought they would have sufficient courage to meet the enemy in the field. The history of the world showed that the great military nations had been composed of either large agricultural or large rural populations. But though town life did, no doubt, enervate the youth of the country, he had no hesitation in saying that we were as good fighters to-day as at any time of our history and that we were not quite the cowards the right hon. Gentleman would seem to suggest. The suggestion that it took years of training and discipline before a Britisher could be got to face the guns in the field of battle was, he thought, not quite true. The fostering of cadet corps in our colleges was not necessary to the Bill in any shape or form. Had the Minister for War devoted his attention to destroying the triple organisation of the Volunteers, the Yeomanry, and the Militia, and unified those forces without attempting to interfere with the school life of the children he would have effected his purpose to a greater extent than he would do by the proposals under discussion. The introduction of this into colleges and public schools and the attempt to establish such institutions as the source from which all our officers should be derived was an attempt to fashion a national Army on a social class basis, and the two principles appeared to him to be antagonistic. It was proposed to draw officers from the great colleges and educational centres which were the special preserve of the rich and well-to-do. They could never make a national Army by excluding the poor merely because they were poor from the higher positions in the new military organisation. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire had said quoting a speech of Lord Palmerston to prove his contention, that it was absolutely necessary to have well-bred officers. That he did not dispute. The only question was what was meant by the term "well-bred." He asserted that there were soldiers in the ranks who might not have all the cultured and polished drawing-room manners that some of our officers possessed, but who, from a military point of view, were equal to any officer in the British Army. Under these circumstances he did not think the quotation was either apt or one which solved the problem. As every one knew, an Act of Geo. III. abolished the sale of offices in every department but the Army. Up to 1871 all the higher offices in the Army were bought, sold, and retained as private vested interests, therefore it was a question of money, not of breeding, up to that time. There was an unfortunate tendency in the present day, especially in Government Departments, to separate into distinct classes the supervisors and the supervised. He was very much afraid that this snobbishness, especially in the great services of the State, the Army and the Navy, this attempt to prove that it was utterly impossible to maintain discipline unless officers were drawn from one class of society and the common soldier from another, this separation of interests, this dividing into castes the Services which ought to be welded together as a whole, was probably the cause of many of our serious disasters in recent campaigns. Now that they were making an attempt to reorganise the forces, it was the business at least of Labour men who represented working men on whom the country had to rely for their fighters—he supposed no one would contest that—to put forth their views on the subject. If members of the working classes were prepared to join the ranks and to risk their lives for the defence of the Empire, they were entitled to a share of the highest offices, provided they had the necessary ability to attain to them. He did not say for one moment that a man should be appointed who was incompetent or without the necessary ability. That was not the suggestion of those who represented the interests of labour. He understood perfectly well that a very strict examination would be necessary; that men would have to qualify themselves for the positions; but once they were qualified, mere social rank should be no bar to their appointment. Unfortunately, at present, the tendency was in the opposite direction. A Return was published in 1885, and it had been brought up to 1899, showing that the number of second lieutenants appointed from the ranks in fourteen years was 343, quartermasters 597, and riding masters 56, total 996 in fourteen years, or 4 per cent. A Return which had recently been issued giving the figures for 1899 to 1902, showed that the percentage had fallen to 2 per cent.; so that it was now twice as difficult for a ranker to rise to commissioned position as it was only a few years ago. ["No."] The hon. and gallant Member opposite said it was not so, but the figures spoke for themselves. Complaint had been made that recruits would not join in sufficient numbers, and that recruits when they were secured were not of the right quality and standard. He believed there was a great deal in that, and he was afraid it would always be so as long as there was no opportunity for the ranker to rise. It might be said that at present he had the opportunity, but he was afraid that the Returns which he had quoted showed that very few got the chance. It was useless on this question merely to express sympathy or a pious opinion. There must be some definite percentage of promotions open to those from the ranks. He was certain that the Secretary for War would be in a position to attract an entirely different class of men if recruiting officers were able to say that there was a definite percentage of higher appointments open to the humblest soldiers of the Army. In France that principle was adopted, but the percentage there was much higher than he would venture to suggest for this country. He thought it would be almost impossible to attract the best men to the Army unless something of the kind he had suggested was done. At the present time he was afraid that they held out no inducements whatever to the best men to join the Army. The pay was very small, the conditions were extremely irksome, and the opportunities offered to a man were practically nil. The consequence was that the Army had been treated as a sort of human dust bin so far as concerned the lower ranks, which were largely composed of men who had probably failed in many other walks of life. He thought that by setting aside a certain percentage of commissions for the ranks, they would be able to attract some of the best of our youth, among both the working and other classes. At any rate, some attempt should be made to democratise the Territorial Force in the way he suggested, because the people would then be drawn into closer sympathy with at least the Home branch of the forces, than they had hitherto been. He would vote for the Second Reading of the Bill, but he hoped that in Committee something would be done in the direction he had indicated. With regard to the pay of the men, it was suggested, he believed, that they should receive a very small sum for their services. The argument had been used that the Regular soldiers objected to fight by the side of the Volunteer or Yeoman, who was receiving perhaps five times the pay. But the soldier who joined the Regular Army made that his profession for a certain number of years, and his position was entirely different from that of the man who left his work for a few months of the year merely to perform his regimental duties in the new Territorial Army. The man might lose his employment; he might find it difficult to return to settled employment when he came back from his training, whether that had been long or short. In these circumstances the two cases were not at all comparable, and some special rate would unquestionably have to be paid to the men of the Territorial Army—a rate far above what they would pay to the men who made soldiering a profession. He thought that the scale of expenditure contemplated under this scheme would have to be very largely extended. There was one other matter he would like to mention. He had known instances where employers had laid it down as a condition that they would not engage Volunteers. He had seen advertisements to that effect. He felt certain that unless the Secretary of State took that fact into consideration, he would fail to secure the number of men that he suggested were required in his Memorandum. The Bill might possibly be amended so as to constitute it intimidation to inquire whether a man was a Volunteer, and to treat as a criminal offence the making it a condition of employment that a man should not belong to the Territorial Army; at any rate, something must be done if they were going to get recruits and properly protect the men who joined. With regard to the proposal to place Volunteers and the Home forces under martial law, he would observe that the term court-martial had a very nasty sound about it. Among the common soldiers there was sometimes a feeling that justice was not always done by the superior officer; and he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised if he considered the policy which had been adopted in France, namely, that courts-martial should not be applied in time of peace even to the Regular forces. Courts-martial would never be submitted to by the Volunteer force of this country. Whilst soldiers and Britishers generally would be prepared to undergo the difficulties of a campaign and submit to the most stringent regulations when engaged in war, he felt certain that the class of the population from which the right hon. Gentleman expected to draw his recruits would be opposed to being placed under any such conditions as were suggested in the Bill. Under these circumstances it would have to be amended in that direction before it could be acceptable to the Labour Leaders of the House. He hoped the Bill would become law. He could quite see, as anyone could see, that it was absolutely necessary to destroy the triple organisation of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, the organisation must be unified. The talk of invasion was to him very peculiar. It was said that we should not be able to get the men in case of invasion, if there were no Territorial Army. If an official paragraph that a hostile army would be landed on our shores were published to-night, a million bayonets would gleam in the sun to-morrow morning and the Secretary of State for War would probably be hung up on the nearest lamp-post if he could not supply them. The military instinct of the nation was as good as ever it was. The Labour Members objected to the suggestion that there should be an enormous striking force, but they accepted the Bill because they knew, as the late Secretary of State for War had declared that afternoon, that this enormous striking force was imaginary and that the real object was to unify and codify the organisation for home defence.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he had noticed small points of difference in the objections raised to this scheme in almost every speech that had been delivered. In his opinion the alterations with regard to the Volunteers were practically nil, and that view applied to courts-martial. In the discussion several notable cases of disagreement had occurred. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newport disagreed at almost every point with the Bill, but the one point upon which he did agree was that they should do away with the Militia. Other Members of the Opposition had expressed exactly the opposite view. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon had attacked his hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abercromby Division for the description he had given of the Swiss Army, which he stated was absolutely out of date. He might say that his hon. and gallant friend's description was quite accurate; as to drill and other matters he had de cribed them exactly as they were last year. Evidently what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon had in his mind was a description of the Swiss Army as it would be years hence when the regulations now being made had come into force. The regulations under this scheme instead of making training more frequent would extend it over fewer years, and that was practically not a material alteration. Nearly half the speakers who had taken part in the debate in opposition to the Bill had mentioned six months training as soon as the Reserves were called out. Where they had got that idea from he did not know, because it was not in the Bill. The only thing provided was that they should be liable to be embodied. The Secretary of State for War had stated that probably six months would be the period required to make them into good soldiers, but in saying that he was merely quoting the opinion of experts; there was nothing in the Bill about six months. The great object of the Bill was that they should be able to get hold of the men when they wanted them. Great objection had been taken to the total of 160,000 men which appeared in the Memorandum. He did not think for a moment that a striking force of 160,000 men was meant. They did not want a striking force of that size to be sent off during the first month of a war; 50,000 troops would be quite sufficient for that purpose. Under this scheme he believed they would have a larger striking force than they had at the beginning of the South African War, and he believed they would have a large number of reinforcements. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had said that the scheme would leave them too much in the hands of the officials, and that the House would lose its power. Surely the House of Commons would be able to stop the supplies when the War Office asked for too much, and that was really what had happened during the last few years. The country would always have that control. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newport had said that the Volunteers were going to be useless, and he had spoken at great length to show how unsuitable they were as soldiers. It was because they were not so useful as they might be that it was proposed in this Bill to alter their *status* and their position. He thought the great principle of the Bill had been generally accepted, namely, that there should be two lines, the first consisting of a striking force available at once. The second line was one which would take time before it was available for service, and would consist of a national Army popular amongst the people, and supported by them in the various districts.

That principle was so much appreciated that he believed the Bill would pass without very great modifications. He did not think the term Territorial Army was a very wise one. He hoped it would be possible to train larger numbers of men together at their training depots in order that the officers might take battalion drill and occasionally brigade drill. The more men they were able to get together the better would be the training of both men and officers. He trusted that the depots would be made larger and that the number of men trained at one time would be increased. The most important thing in the whole scheme was its finance. Ministerialists believed that the strength of the country lay to a great extent in its financial position in the world, and, whatever might be said as to preparedness for war, if the national financial position was sufficiently weakened, large armies would never help us. Therefore they thought that the question of economy was a much more important factor in Imperial matters than hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House seemed to think. He did not quite accept the figures of the Secretary of State. So far as he could see, he believed, like a good many critics, that it would cost a good deal more than was suggested. At the same time he thought even from the economical point of view it was worth while spending a million or so extra in the way proposed. The difficulty in reducing the most expensive part of the war organisation—the Regular Army—was that we had absolutely nothing the soldier would trust to fall back upon. The professional soldier never believed in anyone but the Regular soldier. Nothing else was to be depended on. The general opinion of experts was that the only soldier who would face fire was the man who had had long training But these experts ignored such recent experience as was presented in the war carried on by the Boers and by the success of the Japanese in the late war, who certainly in the later battles fought with men who had not had more than two or three months' training. Sufficient training could be given in a few months to the proposed Territorial Army to constitute a reliable force, and he believed that in time of emergency that reliable force would volunteer by units for garrison duty, and so relieve the Regular soldiers to go to the front. He believed that once we had a good Territorial Army it would be very much cheaper to provide the foreign Army, which was our great difficulty now. Experts would always tell the country that the Reserve Forces were unreliable, but if this scheme were carried out we should have something that could be relied upon by the country and those high in authority at the War Office, and he thought that in future there might be further reductions in the expenditure on the Army. The adoption of the scheme would mean that economy could be realised which under the existing system could not be effected, when there was ever-increasing military expenditure, but no increase of efficiency.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) said he approached the consideration of the subject as an ordinary country squire, and in no way as a military expert. From that point of view, he was interested in the proposal for the establishment of county associations, a proposal which, personally, he thought had much to recommend it. In many counties, and certainly in the county with which he was connected, local feeling was very strong, and it was quite possible that under local administration the best use would be made of the raw material at command. There were certain matters in connection with the establishment of county associations with respect to which he should like more information from the right hon. Gentleman. In the course of the debate it had been frequently pointed out that the tendency undoubtedly was for local work to get heavier and heavier. He thought that the chief end which the right hon. Gentleman had to aim at was to make the work of the county associations as practical as possible, to keep it in the hands of county men without the introduction of other elements. These were matters which might be gone into more fully on the Committee stage of the Bill. Though local work was increasing, there would be no lack of men to undertake the duty, providing the work was responsible and attractive, and confined to county men. There was some apprehension that associations might be governed by outside military men. There was also a fear that membership of an association might entail pecuniary responsibility. The fear he believed was unfounded.

*MR. HALDANE assented.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that there had, at any rate, been that feeling, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would make it abundantly clear that there was no pecuniary liability placed upon gentlemen who composed these organisations. A Memorandum had been issued by the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the scheme, and he confessed he had some little difficulty in understanding the financial proposals contained therein. It provided an approximate estimate of the cost of the Territorial Force. He understood there was nothing in that estimate for the expenditure which would be incurred by the county associations themselves for officials' salaries, rent of offices, and general administrative charges. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman in the course of his reply would give the House some more information as to the cost of the administration of the county associations.

*MR. HALDANE pointed out that there was a statement at the top of page 4 of the Memorandum on that subject.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said it was difficult to arrive at any result from that statement. Roughly speaking, he imagined that it would take about £800 per battalion. He feared that the organisation was bound to be extremely costly, and that we should not get full value for our money. What was more, the greater the success which attended the scheme, and the greater the number of county associations that were formed, the larger would be the demands upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wished that the House and the country should have, if possible, some estimate of the probable cost of the new scheme when it came into full operation. It was very difficult to form any opinion on that point with the materials they had now before them. He had approached the question of the county associations as a country squire; he wished to approach the consideration of Clause 3 through the eyes of the Public Accounts Committee. He had difficulty in understanding what the right hon. Gentleman's proposals were in regard to finance. So far as he could understand it the proposal was that the Army Council was to make a grant-in-aid or a block-grant to the county associations, which was to be at their absolute disposal. The principle of grants-in-aid or block-grants had in the past been open to great apprehension, and the practice was one which they ought not to encourage. At present the Volunteers got a block-grant for the expenses of their corps, but they were not in the same position as the new county associations would be, the latter having a considerable number of duties to discharge which the Volunteers had not to do formerly. It was admitted on all sides that the financial control which this House should exercise over all public expenditure was considerably lessened when the money was voted in block-grants; and he thought that the Secretary of State for War should let hon. Members see before the Bill went into Committee the form in which the new Estimate was to be laid before the House of Commons. That Estimate might amount to £2,000,000 or £3,000,000, and they should not be asked to vote such a large sum of money without being told how that money was going to be spent. He expressed strong disapproval of the drafting of Clause 3 as it stood. It seemed to him that the greatest latitude was allowed to the county associations in regard to the spending of the money, and that the control of the House of Commons was reduced to a minimum. He hoped that the sole power of dealing with the question of finance would not be left in the hands of the Army Council. Again, it was a matter of very considerable doubt whether the House of Commons should agree to a proposal by which they would be required to vote a larger and an increasing sum of money to the county associations without having the accounts audited by their own officials. So far as he could make out there was no provision made for audit by the Comptroller and Auditor General. The county associations were to audit the accounts themselves, and the House of Commons would have no opportunity of exercising that control which they ought to have.

*MR. HALDANE said that this matter had been considered very closely, and it was found that if they did not apply the system of audit proposed by the clause the correspondence of the War Office with the county associations would be interminable.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he would wait to hear the fuller explanation of the right hon. Gentleman when he came to reply on the whole debate; in the meantime he would respectfully say that the House of Commons ought to be most careful before consenting to any proposal which might be considered to weaken their control over expenditure. He was afraid that the right hon. Gentleman's military colleagues had achieved a considerable victory over him in that regard at the expense of the House of Commons in general and of the Public Accounts Committee in particular.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.) said he could assure the hon. Member that the Comptroller and Auditor General would have the same control over the new grants as he had at present over the Capitation Grant.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH admitted that the present arrangement was far from perfect, but it should not be weakened. He was not a military expert, but, so far as he understood the scheme, he thought that the right hon, Gentleman had made reductions in the Regular Army before he knew what was going to be put in their place.

*MAJOR McMICKING (Kirkcudbrightshire) said he found himself in rather an embarrassing position, because although he was in favour of the principle of the Bill and would give it his support on Second Reading he felt great apprehension with regard to the proposal to create 140 mobile Volunteer batteries of artillery, especially when fourteen of these batteries would be horse artillery batteries. In regard to the artillery, there were two very interesting speeches delivered in the House during the debate the previous day. He was in complete agreement with what fell from the hon. Member for Fareham in reference to the artillery. As to the speech of the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool he would like to say a few words. He would take the following quotation from his speech, as reported in *The Times*—

> "If people who did not want to fight could be eliminated from the Army by the principle of voluntary service, and the requisite number of men could still be got, it followed that the Army would be more formidable than under a system of compulsion."

That was not a very convincing argument. He believed it to be true with regard to the rank and file, but it was misleading as regards officers especially for the artillery. When the hon. and gallant Member compared the Swiss artillery system with the proposed Territorial Army artillery he could see no analogy between the two. He would like to give to the House some figures with regard to the Swiss system. All artillery officers in the Swiss Army must have served in the ranks. At nineteen years of age every man in the country was examined medically and all who were fit must serve for twelve years in the Elite, for thirteen years in the Landwehr, and for five years in the Landsturm, making thirty years in all. Thus in the Swiss Army, where they had all these men, those of energy and talent strove to become officers in the force, and there was great emulation. Before a man became an officer he had to pass a recruit's course of fifty-five days; repetition course, eighteen days; non-commissioned officer's course, thirty-five days; recruit's course as non-commissioned officer, sixty-three days; and officer's preparatory courses, 105 days, making 276 days in all or nine months before he became an artillery officer. That was quite a different state of things from that which would exist in the Territorial Army. Before non-commissioned officers in the Swiss Army were selected for the officer's preparatory course they had to undergo an examination in general knowledge. Captains and majors had to attend special courses for officers of their rank to qualify for promotion. Promotion did not go by seniority only, and the pick of each rank only was promoted. The hon. and gallant Gentleman in a previous debate drew an analogy from or rather based his arguments on the experience of the

South African War. No doubt a great many useful lessons could be learnt from that war, but so far as artillery was concerned that war had taught us very little. If the Boers had used their guns in batteries, and if their shrapnel fire had been effective, half our artillery would have been wiped out. Our batteries as a rule had to come into action in the open against the Boer artillery in prepared positions. He would like to ask a question in regard to the special contingent batteries. He believed there were thirty-three batteries for training special contingent officers and men. They would be armed with 198 eighteen-pounder guns. Their functions would be that of training men so that drafts could be sent out for the Army over sea. Let them take a hypothetical case of our field force being engaged over sea, and suppose that at a critical time another European Power joined the enemy against whom we were engaged and a danger of raid and invasion became imminent. He would like to know what would happen to those 198 guns. Would they continue to be used for training drafts for the field force over sea or would they be used to repel raid or invasion? He did not think any War Minister could come down to the House and say, if there was any danger of raid or invasion, he proposed to send the forces of the Territorial Army into action armed with fifteen-pounders while there were these eighteen-pounders in the country.

*MR. HALDANE said there were not only the guns of the batteries but there were also the reserve guns, but it was impossible to forecast beforehand what would be done.

*MAJOR McMICKING suggested that the batteries armed with these eighteen-pounder guns should be put on a four-gun basis and should be available in time of need. Anyone who had had the slightest acquaintance of the Army from within must be aware of the magnitude and complexity of the problem with which the Secretary for War was confronted. The right hon. Gentleman and his expert advisers had been hard at work for over a year obtaining a solution to the problem, and they had been assisted by various Committees appointed to investigate subsidiary questions underlying the main problem. As a result they had the Bill now before them. The scheme for its success entirely depended on the patriotic feelings of our fellow citizens. That was a high ideal, especially when it was remembered that the conditions of service in the proposed Territorial Army would be more onerous than the conditions of service in the Volunteer force to-day. He was glad that the right hon. Gentleman had not been afraid of a high ideal and that he had faith in the patriotism of his fellow countrymen, and he saw no reason why the 300,000 men should not be forthcoming. It was argued that it would be impossible to obtain the men, but the scheme would be a test of the free and compulsory education which the nation had been getting for the last thirty-six years. If that education had been on sound lines, if it had truly developed character, he was inclined to think that there would be no difficulty in obtaining men willing to serve. No doubt many men now serving in the Volunteers would be unable for various reasons to continue to serve in the Territorial Army. On the other hand a National Army, with a clear and definite sphere of action marked out for it, would appeal to many men who hitherto had held aloof because they believed, rightly or wrongly, that the Volunteers were not and never had been taken seriously by the military authorities. Then again compulsory service had been mentioned. He himself was opposed to any form of compulsion, but there were many people who were asking why 300,000 men should be asked to bear the burden, to make sacrifices for home defence, and whether the burden ought not to be borne by the whole of our male adult population. But whatever scheme might be introduced, compulsory or voluntary, the burden would still be borne by 300,000 men; it was the quality that would vary. Provided the officers were efficient, the quality of a force composed of men who served from patriotic motives and from love of soldiering would be very much better than that of a force composed of men who were compelled to serve.

All good citizens were to some extent called upon to make sacrifices, and he saw no reason why a sufficient number of men should not welcome the opportunity to render effective service for their country. Public opinion rightly directed for the next decade would do more to bring a useful territorial force suited to our needs into being than any amount of compulsion would be able to accomplish. He had spoken of public opinion, and he hoped the women of Britain would use their influence to make the scheme a success. Their patriotism was one of our greatest national assets, and they could do much to help. After all, this was a matter which intimately concerned them. The Territorial Army was essentially a force for the protection of our hearths and homes, and it was in no sense an aggressive force. When he said that he did not mean that the National Army would never be called upon to take the offensive. In war the most effective defence was that known as the defensive offensive. In certain eventualities it might happen that part of the Territorial Army would be asked to volunteer to serve abroad in order to take the offensive. To some hon. Members that might seem a strange *rôle* for a non-aggressive army to play. It was not so really, because under certain conditions a blow delivered at an enemy oversea would be the most effective method of protecting our own shores. Another objection was that this territorial scheme would involve the putting of the Militia, the Yeomanry and the Volunteer Forces into the melting pot, and it was said that there would be produced a mixture of unknown quality called a Territorial Army. It was quite true that the several parts of the Auxiliary Forces would be welded into a National Army organised in a scientific manner. There might be differences as to whether the number of men required would be obtained, and perhaps on other points, but surely if experts were worth anything at all they should have no difficulty in forming a sound judgment as to the quality of the force which would be created under the scheme. There was every reason to suppose the special contingent officers and men would be better trained and would reach a higher level of proficiency than the Militia had done, at any rate during the last twenty-five years. He saw no reason why *esprit de corps* should not flourish in the new Army. In his opinion it would become broader and deeper, because each man in addition to his *esprit de corps* for his own regiment would develop a pride in and affection for the National Army as a whole. Whilst that Army would on the one hand encourage healthy emulation between corps, it would on the other hand obliterate invidious distinctions between different branches of the services. He again appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to move very cautiously in the creation of mobile Volunteer Artillery, and to give the matter further consideration. Some time ago the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War compared gunners to theologians. He at any rate was not dogmatic in this matter, having had experience by means of his sense perceptions, and could not therefore be bracketed with the theologians. If Volunteer field batteries were to be created he sincerely hoped it would be done very gradually; any step in that direction should be in the nature of an experiment.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the hon. Member for Stoke had compared the French and British officers, but without saying anything derogatory to the French officers he thought we had nothing to be ashamed of in our own officers. With one statement of the hon. Member, however, he cordially agreed. The hon. Gentleman had said that those who served in the Territorial Army should be more highly paid than those who served in the Regular Army. With that he agreed, for the reason stated by the hon. Member. It seemed to him that the scheme of the county associations was likely to be successful, and he hoped it would be, but whenever he spoke to a soldier upon the question he always received the same reply. On the previous night he asked a distinguished General Officer what he thought of the Bill and the scheme, and the reply was that it was a capital scheme, that not a man would be obtained to serve under such conditions, and that then we should have to have conscription, which was what the Army wanted. That was the view of many soldiers, and it was the danger which he was anxious to avoid. Unless they were prepared to give the best terms and good pay, and to make sure that those who served in the Territorial Army were not treated in a way which they would think unfair, there would be the danger of the country saying "This is not good enough," and we should be driven to conscription. He strongly opposed compulsion so long as we could get a voluntary force. From the figures given by the hon. Member for the Richmond Division of Yorkshire he understood that the Yeomanry were to receive 10s. 8d. per day instead of 10s. 9d. as at present, so that the Yeoman would be only a penny the worse off.

Mr. ACLAND said he made several qualifications of that statement.

Mr. LANE-FOX said that in spite of the qualifications of the hon. Member there would be a considerable difference between the payment made to the Yeoman in the future and that made in the past.

Mr. ACLAND said the difference would not be anything like so much as the hon. Member would seem to suggest.

Mr. LANE-FOX said in that case he wished the War Office memoranda had been a little more explicit, because the impression given by them was that the Yeomanry would suffer a considerable loss, and in consequence there was considerable unrest and discontent in the Yeomanry with regard to the new conditions suggested. He hoped the Secretary of State would take the opportunity of explaining that the scheme was not what it was thought to be in this regard, and that it afforded a much better prospect for the Yeomanry in the future than was generally anticipated. The House ought to be particularly careful in dealing with the Yeomanry, because, although men could be obtained who with a short course of training would become competent infantry soldiers, unless a particular class was appealed to we could not obtain an effective force of men who could shoot and ride. Such men were not easy to find, and unless young farmers, butchers, well-to-do clerks, veterinary surgeons, and others who had an opportunity of living among and learning the habits of horses were appealed to we should not get men who with a short training would become effective Yeomanry. A horseman could not be made in a fortnight, and if the pay was reduced and the comfort of the men diminished the right hon. Gentleman would run the risk of getting the wrong class of men. He therefore hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to modify his views in this matter. The question of having a Regular adjutant was most important. It was far more important to have a Regular adjutant under the new scheme than under the present system. He did not believe it was possible, especially in the case of the Yeomanry regiments, which had to cover a large area, to get men effectively to carry out the duties required for £100 a year and to carry on their civilian duties as well. Another important point was that no provision had been made for rifle ranges, which were one of the crying needs of the Yeomanry at the present time, and the provision of which would do more than anything else to make the Yeomanry effective. The right hon. Gentleman had appealed to the country gentlemen to find rifle ranges, and that appeal would be responded to now as such appeals had been responded to in the past. But they could not help feeling that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite were doing their best to undermine and kill the patriotism of the country gentlemen by their actions in the House. Here, however, was an opportunity for them to show that they realised the influence of the country gentlemen in matters of this kind, and had a higher appreciation of it than they were sometimes willing to admit. The appeal which had been made would be responded to, but he hoped the Secretary of State would not set them too hard a task. If the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to make the conditions of those who served in the Territorial Army sufficiently good; if he was going to endeavour to run the Territorial Army on the cheap, and get a voluntary service at less than it was worth, he would not get the response he hoped for. He did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Newport

Division of Shropshire that Yeomen wished to make money out of training. If that were true at all it was in only a small proportion of cases. What the Yeomen wanted was comfort and not to be out of pocket; and he certainly hoped that he would be allowed full dress for walking out. Everybody knew the value of that. If the Yeomen were treated fairly the right hon. Gentleman might rely on having the force maintained at its present strength, a thoroughly efficient and strong force. Therefore he would press the right hon. Gentleman not to level down but to level up this and other branches of the service in order to make them strong and efficient.

*MR. A. L. LEVER (Essex, Harwich) thought that the Bill was the most serious attempt made for many years to consolidate our strength and to convert the forces of this country into a real fighting machine. But it appeared to him that there was one weakness, which had been debated at very considerable length, and which he wanted to emphasise. When all was said and done they must judge of the measure, not by its strongest, but by its weakest link. The plan enunciated by the right hon. Gentleman to transform the various independent and disconnected units into one homogeneous whole must commend itself to anyone who had at all considered the subject. In fact it was a matter of surprise to him that the present system had been allowed to grow up under successive War Ministers untouched: a system while it made provision for training the troops, made no provision for providing the supplementary auxiliary services, which were absolutely essential if those disunited units were ever to be called upon to take the field. The plan devised by the right hon. Gentleman was an admirable one if it could be carried out successfully, but for his own part he was rather doubtful whether that could be done unless the pay of the rank and fife was materially increased. If it failed, as he feared it would, unless they saw an augmentation in the grants, then he feared that they were face to face with an inevitable condition of things, which, if it was not to be conscription as they had it in continental countries, would be some form of compulsory training. The success of the whole of this proposal must necessarily depend upon obtaining the required recruits. Now was it to be expected that under the conditions which they were offering—offering very little and asking for a great deal—that they would obtain a sufficiency of men. Even assuming that patriotism was running high, that the martial spirit was dominant, and that militarism was for the hour as it had never been before, even under those conditions he did not think that a sufficient number of men would be found who could afford to make a sacrifice of eight or fifteen days work for the remuneration offered under this scheme. Their wages might be high in certain districts and in given trades, but if they took the average wage of working men in towns and cities and rural districts he thought they would find that there was a very small margin for them to provide for themselves in such a way as to enable them to make the sacrifice that this system would involve. He acknowledged that the same rate of wages was to be granted as in the Regular service, but then the conditions existing with the men of the two services would be absolutely different. A man might enter the Army because he was unable to get work, but when he did enter the Army he would get 365 days pay in the year, whereas the man of the Territorial Army might, in civil life, be out of work, or only partially employed for a considerable portion of the year or for some portion of the year. Then he might be a married man and have his home to maintain. Was it likely that when his period of training came round, and when perhaps he was in a good job, that he would be prepared to sacrifice fifteen days pay in order to undertake the obligation on the unremunerative terms which were offered? Personally he did not think that he would, and therefore he feared that they would not get the requisite number of men. If the Bill was to accomplish the hopes of the Secretary for War he appealed to him to consider the rate of pay of all arms of the new Territorial Force. He recognised full well the elasticity that was provided by the Bill—an elasticity which, he thought, commended itself to all sides of the House. This elasticity permitted of the annual training being abandoned altogether if necessary, but the moment they did that they were in a worse position than, or in an equally bad position, as they were to-day; our

Territorial Force would certainly be no better than the Volunteer force was at the present moment. Then they were asked to imagine that the county associations would stimulate recruiting. Possibly they would to a small extent, but they could not possibly stimulate it to the required extent unless they had the necessary funds at their command. No one deprecated more than he did any suggestion of a raid on the National Exchequer, because he felt with many Members of the House that the first thing they had to do was to make some provision for what the people of this country had so long and so anxiously been waiting for, and which he hoped would come in the very near future, and that was a scheme of old-age pensions. As to the question of the adjutants, he felt that if they abandoned the professional adjutant connected with the regiment they would certainly be making a great mistake. After the remarks of the hon. Member for the Richmond Division of Yorkshire, he understood that it would be altered, and that they would have, as it were, a second adjutant attached to the regiment. For his own part he did not care much whether the adjutant belonged to the Regular force or to the Territorial Force, but he thought he should be in any case a man thoroughly qualified to occupy the position and to carry out the duties. Therefore, he considered that before any adjutant was appointed to a regiment he should undergo some examination to prove that he was specially qualified for the position. The Bill seemed to resolve itself into a choice of one of two things: inadequate pay, which would lead us, he thought, without much doubt, to a system of compulsory training; or, adequate pay, which would lead us to the realisation and consummation of a great scheme, that would hand down the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War as that of a man who had grappled with a great and complex question and had solved it to the advantage of the nation and of the Empire at large.

MR. GUY BARING (Winchester) said that some surprise had been expressed on the other side of the House at the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dover, but he had no hesitation in giving that Amendment his support. Still he did not wish to see the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman wrecked, because he thought there was a great deal in it of the utmost value. They on the Opposition side of the House had had two shots at Army reform, and he was ready to help the right hon. Gentleman in his shot. But he was not confident that this scheme would give an adequate support to the Regular Army in time of war; and for this reason, that the right hon. Gentleman had done away with the Militia and had not substituted for it a better force. The Government appeared to be particularly fond, to judge from the words of the hon. Member for the Richmond Division of Yorkshire, of the seventy-four third battalions which were to produce the draft units when war broke out. What training would the men of those battalions have had? When those men were sent to fill the gaps in the Regular force not one of them would ever have seen his officers or his comrades, and as far as he could see the men would have been trained in the depots. They would never have seen the battalions on parade, and the drafts instead of being of assistance would certainly for three months be a dead weight, and men in the battalions would have to be told off to complete the training of the men, thus putting a double duty upon them. He believed that to be one of the great faults of the scheme. He thought it would be proved, and that the right hon. Gentleman would have to acknowledge it, that that scheme was going to cost more than had been suggested, and from what he had heard in the debate he was certain that there was a school of thought which would induce the right hon. Gentleman, if possible, to finance the scheme at the expense of the Regular Army, and they would see further reductions of the Regular Army asked for. The force which had been most fiercely attacked was the expeditionary force of 160,000 men. Of that expeditionary force, his one ewe lamb, the right hon. Gentleman had every right to be proud. He certainly hoped that no attack made on the Regular force would induce the Secretary of State to reduce that expeditionary force by even one man. He had pointed out two dangers of the scheme, and now he would point to one of its advantages, namely, that it brought the Army more into popular touch. He had no hesitation in saying that a soldier in time of peace was thought very little of, and military opinion carried little weight. The ordinary man at an election meeting would sooner listen to a politician than to the warnings of any soldier. He thought this scheme would do away with that state of things, and that in future authority in military matters would come from the people. When that came about he believed they would have the national defence of the country nearest to the people's hearts, and the voice crying in the wilderness would not be that of men like Lord Roberts, but that of men like the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that possibly the Secretary of State for War would like to hear from a Member who had recently visited his constituency what sort of an impression the scheme had made upon a well-known military district. Welshpool was a district famous for soldiers in the past, and it had provided a great many men for the Auxiliary Forces, as well as large contributions to the Regulars. The march of Shropshire and Montgomeryshire, which gave the great Lord Clive, could and would find many a good soldier yet. He thought it was most important to know what the Volunteers and the class which supplied them thought of this new scheme. He was glad to be able to tell the right hon. Gentleman, after having been at great pains to find out, that they thought very well of his plans in his constituency, and the Volunteers in particular seemed to be extremely well satisfied. The people he represented were high spirited and patriotic, and did not look upon soldiering as a degrading profession. They were not in favour of conscription, but they were in favour of a system under which men who were strong and well enough to serve should have an opportunity given to them of serving their country under a voluntary system. Consequently they approved of the scheme in so far as it related to the Volunteers. He did not find in his constituency the state of things which the hon. Member for Walsall said existed, namely, a total want of interest in such a subject as this. In the Montgomery district he found the keenest interest taken in what was contemplated under this scheme for the Volunteers, but he was not in a position to say that he found that the Militia were as pleased with the scheme as the Volunteers. He was not competent to go into details of this question such as a soldier might discuss, but he might, he thought, venture to state that both the Militia and the Volunteers were anxious that the professional adjutant should be retained. He thought opinion was pretty unanimous upon that point. In view of the feeling engendered when the Cardwell reforms were introduced he expressed the hope that the present nomenclature would in some way be retained as far as possible, because he thought it was essential that names should be retained which would preserve as far as possible the individuality of the present regiments which was precious to the members of those particular regiments, because *esprit de corps*, and proper pride in individuality were conducive to discipline and to everything else that went to make a good fighting battalion. He did not know what the Secretary of State for War's intention was in that respect, and he was afraid that a Question which he put on the Paper recently was not very adroitly put, because he did not succeed in getting the desired information. If the right hon. Gentleman would bear in mind that there was a strong feeling on this subject, his object in raising it would have been attained. With regard to the Yeomanry, he believed there was a feeling existing such as had been referred to by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Newport, that it would be a great pity to deprive them during the period of training of anything which would tend to make that time a pleasant outing as well as a useful military training. He was inclined to think the Yeomanry would rejoice if the more stringent canteen regulations, or whatever they were, would be modified and matters left more upon the present footing. He was himself a supporter of the Bill, and he mentioned these matters because he knew the Volunteers in his own district favoured the scheme and were quite ready to come forward to make it a success in a public spirited manner. He thought it only right to tell the right hon. Gentleman that he believed, though he did not feel here upon such firm ground, that the other two branches of the force also shared this feeling but with reservation, and in his county he believed the men would come forward to serve their country under the new scheme. It had been suggested to him by gentlemen well competent to express opinions that some little extra privileges might be given to Volunteers, and one of the things suggested was that those who joined under the new scheme should be exempted from jury service. Another suggestion was that a bonus of something like £5 should be given to them, such as was given to Regulars when they took their discharge or went into the Reserve. If the right hon. Gentleman would consider those two suggestions he would be greatly obliged to him. He had heard some doubts expressed as to the value of these county committees, but so far as his own inquiries went, he would like to inform the House that he had heard nothing but good of them, and the general belief which had been expressed was that they would be very valuable recruiting agencies. He believed that employers would be ready and willing to give, within reasonable limits, and subject to certain remarks he had to make, such extensions of holidays as might be required, and they were quite ready to fall in with the spirit of the new scheme. Of course, after all, success must depend upon the Volunteers themselves. With regard to what the hon. Member for Richmond had said about the Lancashire Artillery Militia he thought it was only fair to state that that was not a representative, but a hybrid corps, in which there were a great many artillery men and officers from the line, and he was afraid the House would be likely to be misled if it took that corps as a typical Artillery Militia corps. He would not urge at the present time upon the House and the country the great expense which would be incurred by arming the Artillery Militia with a better gun, and he could not see against whom they were likely to have to use it, so long as they kept the Fleet up to the proper mark. But it was necessary that all branches of our Army, Regular or Auxilliary, infantry or artillery, should learn to shoot straight and that there should be no savings effected in the supply of powder. The greatest peacemaker living, President Roosevelt, said that the best way to keep peace was to learn to shoot straight. He thought it was highly necessary that practice with the guns should be developed as much as possible. The other day he was reading a recent account of the Chinese Army. It seemed that upon one occasion a perplexed general invoked the aid of the god of war, and instead there appeared someone more like the god Bacchus. The colonel said that what he wanted was the god of war, but he received the reply that the god of war was otherwise engaged, and that the visitor was the target god, and as none of the Chinese artillerymen or other soldiers had ever done him any harm in their lives he had come to see what help he could give the general in his turn. They did not want the target god in this country to be on the best possible terms with the artillery of the Territorial Army or any other force, and he believed that money should be forthcoming and arrangements should be made for a proper and sufficient practice for the artillery of the Territorial Army. There was one other matter which he would like to mention, and that was the references to India made in the speech of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean.

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, further proceeding was postponed without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 4.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND LAND PURCHASE.

*MR. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury) rose to call attention to the powers of purchasing and holding land enjoyed by local authorities, and to move a Resolution declaring that, in the opinion of the House, a measure was urgently needed enabling local authorities to acquire by agreement or compulsorily land needed for the requirments of the inhabitants, the purchase price being definitely based upon the value at which such land was assessed for purposes of taxation. This question, he said, lay at the root of all the social questions with which they had to deal. There was too much rather than too little evidence on the question, the inquiries held from time to time into small holdings, rural housing, and town holdings, and other matters, having shown how the inability to buy land affected the whole of the local authorities of the country. Most students of the question were familiar with their Reports. Nor was it necessary to give the House statistics of overcrowding in towns and in the country districts. The difficulty arose from the nature of the land, which was different from every other necessity of life. It was the basis of all life and industry; it was indispensable to all men and could not be made by any man; and position was of the essence of its value—it could not be moved; water, building materials, and food could be brought in to supply a scarcity. The possession of land also gave an arbitrary power over the persons and the property of the inhabitants which it was the duty of the State to diminish rather than protect. This power was intensified in cities. In a debate which took place in that House in 1890 the present Lord Chancellor said—

> "Urban land had a special increment in value which arose solely when it became vitally necessary in the interest of a congested population, and it was that which differentiated it from all other classes of property."

It was this vital factor in modern life which was left in the hands of private owners to withhold from use at their own irresponsible will except after long and costly processes for some definite scheme. The evils of the existence of this tyrannical power became more unbearable as cities grew. Industries and labour engaged therein centred more and more in cities. Almost all cities and all industries lived, as it were, in a hostile country. Every town was beleaguered, was in a state of siege, and if it desired to expand its dwellings or works it must pay ransom to the surrounding landholders, who, as such, preyed only on its vitality and did not increase its prosperity. These things had been said before by, he believed, every member of the Ministry from the latest recruit on the Treasury bench to the Lord Chancellor and the Premier. In his great appeal to the country the Premier said that the land should become less of a pleasure ground for the rich, and more of a treasure house for the people. One might transpose the statement and say that the land should become less of a treasure house for the rich, and more of a pleasure ground for the people. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had in a speech denounced the present system which enabled a landowner capriciously, or from a mistaken sense of his own interest, to refuse to allow the use of his land for building and other purposes, though it was absolutely necessary for the due development of the community. The right hon. Gentleman had further stated that there was no power vested in the community to obtain the land which was so essential to its life and health, and that while the land was lying idle it did not contribute, under our law, a single penny to defray the growing expenses of the community. Even if the owner did sell, it only widened the lines of circumvallation within which the poor must dwell. The poor man must live near his work, but the rich man could daily escape to cheaper land. Again, if the landlord did sell, it was not by one single indemnity but successive indemnities, inch by inch almost, that the right to live and the right to work was bought. If the community by one great indemnity on any reasonable basis could ransom its life from the restraining bonds in which it was held the cost would be soon recouped. The Secretary of State for India, in supporting the Motion by the present Lord Chancellor in 1890, said that if Mills's advice had been taken in 1870 or so "enough would have been intercepted to meet the demand of a great society like the Metropolis." He would instance one or two cases to show the difference to the city possessing land instead of being in the hands of such a landlord as he had described. In 1635 Lord Molyneux purchased the lordship of Liverpool for £450, and speedily began to assert his rights. The corporation resented this, and bought of him a lease of 1,000 acres in Lord Street district for 999 years, at a fixed rental of £30. Recently a small plot at the corner of Exchange Street was sold at a rate equal to £1,093,840 per acre. Fifty years ago the annual value of this 1,000 acres was estimated to be £50,000. In 1837 Liverpool owned an estate worth £3,000,000; in the last forty-five years that estate had doubled in value. The result of this far reaching policy had been that last year Liverpool had an amount of £147,000 from land and buildings to set against the rates, amounting to a reduction of 10d. in the pound. In his own town of Preston the burgesses obtained certain rights under King John, they were continued under Henry II. at a fixed rent, and the inhabitants bought the fee farm rent from the Commonwealth for a comparatively small sum. It was bought over again from Charles II. with impartial loyalty. That land had been of tremendous value to Preston for their parks, electricity works, destructors, etc., and there had been a constant check on land speculation. In the parish of Plumstead an estate of 250 acres was valued in 1845 when the income was £750, at about £15,000. An increase in the Government works at Woolwich necessitated additional house accommodation and this increase was inevitable, and not speculative. If the locality could have purchased the estate what would have been the position now? The income was now £15,000 per annum. By 1915, when the seventy years leases expired the landlord would have received about £1,000,000 in additional rent, and in less than ten years he would get property worth £1,000,000 by reversion. The descendants of the men who built the property would have nothing. He would like to refer to what had taken place in New Zealand. There large estates were given over to sheep and a few hired labourers. Many owners sat down and waited for the Government to build roads, railways, and bridges, when they would be able to realise at a profit. The Government met the emergency. Measures were taken to prevent that being done, and where there were formerly a few hired shepherds there were now hundreds if not thousands of settlers. What were the present powers of local authorities? Generally it might be taken as a working principle that land was only to be acquired by corporations under the authority of a statute, and then only sufficient for a specific purpose. The power given was only compulsory where the object to be attained was of great and pressing importance, and where there would be obvious difficulty in getting land by agreement. In other cases the power was generally merely given to purchase land in the open market. In almost every case these powers had, for some reason or other, been very jealously limited by Parliament, and care always seemed to be exercised to prevent local authorities taking more land than was strictly necessary for their immediate purpose. What was more, an owner was able to force the local authority to purchase the whole of his property; but the local authority was bound to sell the surplus. There were also certain special powers for allotments, housing, small holdings, etc., but the Acts were full of restrictions and of provisions which obstructed their working. If land was bought for one purpose, the whole process had to be gone over again if that land were devoted to another purpose; whereas a private owner bought land out and out. The one thing which seemed to be denied to the local authorities was the exercise of foresight and intelligent anticipation of future needs. However inevitable expansion might be, land could only be acquired by local authorities by a definite scheme and plan backed by Provisional Order or Bill, with full notice to everybody and after the civic war of the arbitration court. Let them take some cases of the expense of purchase. The Glasgow Corporation required for an improvement sixty yards of ground. £700 was asked for it, and £122 was awarded by the arbiters. The expenses of the purchase, however, paid by the Corporation amounted to £1,052—£407 for the claimant, £365 for the arbiters, and £280 expenses incurred by the corporation. There was another case in which £1,000 was claimed, and £279 was granted; while the expenses amounted to £460. Efforts had been made to reduce these costs by limited arbitration. At Bury a couple of cottages were bought for widening a roadway, at a cost of £115; and the arbitration expenses reached £43 14s. 4d. Then in the case of the Water Board there were eight arbitrations, and it was agreed that only one arbitrator should sit; no counsel or solicitors were employed, and only one witness in each case was called. Yet the cost of buying land to the value of £10,525 reached £836. In another case a farm was bought for £1,670, and the cost of the purchase amounted up to £288. A small country public-house was valued at £1,780, and the arbitration expenses amounted to £608. However absurd the claims of the owner might be, the corporation had always to pay the cost. In regard to the expense of purchase of land in the country, he would take the case mentioned by Sir Edmund Verney, who said—

> "We have a system of land encumbrances built up during many generations by the most skilful lawyers the world has ever seen. With the result that when a labourer, or a farmer, or a small capitalist wants to buy a plot of land for a small holding, he finds even a willing landowner helplessly enmeshed in settlements, mortgages, charges, and claims, which choke his every effort."

Of this Sir Edmund Verney gave the following amusing example—

> "A few years ago after selling a row of four cottages with small gardens attached, I went to the solicitor for my money, and he presented me with his bill showing that the expense of the sale had not only swallowed up the whole of the purchase money, but that a sum of £25 was still owing to him."

Those difficulties would always exist until a sound Valuation Bill was brought in, and passed into law. A good many people thought that a Valuation Bill might supply a basis—not fix—but be a basis for the actual price to be given to the owner of the land purchased, be a factor in determining the purchase money. Neither the national nor local taxation assessment bore any relation to the price the public had to pay for land. Valuation for death duties bore no relation to the price which the nation must pay if it found that it wanted a site for a barracks, say on Salisbury Plain. Assessments for local taxation bore no relation to the price of land if that were required for water works. A Valuation Bill had been promised which should secure a separate land valuation bearing a just relation to the value of the land, and the price to be paid for it. There would necessarily be certain expenses for severance and removal; but the dominant factor should be the valuation for local and national taxation. That would enable the public to purchase land at a fair value. If the assessment was not fair, let it be made fair. He and his hon. friends who supported the Resolution were not proposing that the landlord should be taxed out of existence, though that charge was sometimes made against them. But even that might not be inequitable if the process was sufficiently long drawn out. However, he would not argue that point now. What they wanted was that the purchase should be made at a fair price. No raven on a withered branch need croak "confiscation" at the resolution he had moved. But if confiscation was mentioned they must look at both sides. When Leeds was undertaking a great waterworks scheme, the city required 400 acres, which had been rated at 10s. an acre. But the price asked for that land was very nearly £200,000, or at the rate of 998 years purchase. The effect of that was to decrease the chance of employment and to increase the cost of living in Leeds. There was nobody in Leeds who had not some part of his earnings confiscated by such a price. The Postmaster-General in a recent speech said that—

> "The existing state of things was confiscation of the property of the community by a few individuals."

SIR F. BANBURY: Might I ask what Leeds did pay for the land?

*MR. TOULMIN said he could not say.

SIR F. BANBURY: What they asked does not matter.

*MR. TOULMIN thought it did matter. It showed what the landlords thought they were entitled to extort from the community. He would not ask at the present moment how those landowners had got this power, or on what terms they had obtained the land. He made no charge against persons, but he did charge the House of Commons with too long allowing this question to remain unsolved. Another charge which was made in regard to the change which he advocated was that if the powers of public bodies were extended they would be more than ever open to jobbery. He ventured to suggest that the more the plunder, the more the corruption; and that if the plunder were decreased, the jobbery would decrease. The experience of other countries proved this, and that the extended powers given to local authorities for the purchase of land rather tended to extinguish the mere speculator. It was feared that there might be wholesale land speculation by local authorities. He did not think that was well founded, because local authorities were rather difficult to move, than prone to rush into rash ventures. He maintained that our municipalities and county councils were conservative in action. In his opinion, land reform should take the direction of increasing the powers of the local authorities who could safely be trusted. In the cities they had vaster problems to face than were recorded in any previous age. Our civilisation would either sink or develop into a finer flower than the world had ever yet known. With its attention distracted in a hundred ways, the House of Commons could not be the directing force. That must be found in the patriotic labours of the foremost citizens of great cities whose hands the House should not tie. This was not a political move on the part of himself and the supporters of the Resolution. The problem was pressing on every growing municipality. Five hundred and fifty rating authorities had joined to support the committee working for the taxation of ground values, and they were looking forward to a Government Valuation Bill. The House had no time to ascertain the needs of localities; the localities themselves must have powers to deal with the evils in their midst. In cities power should be given to the local authority to foresee their development, to lay out the land which would be occupied in the future, to extend the industrial area, to crush the slums without imposing an intolerable financial burden on the community. In the country a career ought to be found for the labourer, who should have a public authority to ensure security for the cottage in which he dwelt. Did hon. Members ever think of the brooding uncertainty of a country labourer who was a weekly tenant, and knew not when he might lose his cottage, or where he could go afterwards? If Parliament did its duty the gross tyranny of such a case as was mentioned by the present Lord Chancellor when he moved his Resolution on land values in 1890 would be impossible. That was the case of a Devonshire village, the inhabitants of which bore the same names as were recorded in Domesday Book. The landlord considered that it was too expensive to re-build the cottages of the fisherfolk which were falling into disrepair; and half the population was driven away, because the fisherfolk did not work for the farmers on the landlord's land. If the county council were given compulsory powers to buy land they would have a ready instrument by which to fight such tyranny as that. He had passed a self-denying ordinance as to the time that he thought a Member ought to occupy in moving a Resolution such as this. He had reached that limit, and would therefore beg to move.

*MR. WALTERS (Sheffield, Brightside), in seconding the Resolution, said it was only necessary for him to occupy a short time, because the proposer had dealt with the subject in a very comprehensive manner. He had proposed to quote a number of figures, but he would content himself with giving an illustration in one concrete case. It had reference to a town of over 200,000 population, of which he had very close and intimate knowledge. He took the trouble sometime ago carefully to collect figures from conveyances and legal documents as to the value of unbuilt-on land adjacent to houses, and he found that between 1872 and 1902 the value had increased to such an extent that the increase if capitalised at 3 per cent. yielded a sufficient sum of money not only to pay the entire rates of the borough, but to leave a considerable sum of money for distribution among the ratepayers. These figures came upon him with such overwhelming force that he decided he would do everything he could to help forward the increase of power for the purchase of land by local authorities and municipalities generally. That was a phenomenal case, but, to a lesser extent, in the last fifty years, in all the large centres of population, that sort of thing had gone on, and it would continue to go on, and the improved land values would go in an increasing proportion into the pockets of private landowners unless the House of Commons intercepted at least a portion of that value. He did not blame the landlords. They only did what business men would do; they took advantage of opportunities for making money. He blamed the House of Commons for depriving local authorities and municipalities of the power of preventing these men making money. The question was, ought local authorities to have such a power? Why should power be given to local authorities for specific and not for general purposes? One strong reason why they should have these powers was that the aggregation of population in large centres was responsible for this increase of land values, while that very aggregation threw upon the local authorities a large expenditure in reference to public health and other matters. It seemed to him that if that increase in values, and the increased expenditure of local authorities were effects of the same cause, surely those two effects might be made interdependent, and the increased value of land in a large town should be used to meet at least some of the expenditure which the aggregation of population in large centres involved. The present state of things imposed a burden upon private enterprise, but always when they asked for increased power for municipalities or the State, vested interests stepped in and said that to give it would check enterprise and injure trade and commerce. In this case the exact reverse would be the result, because trade and commerce were seriously hampered by the high prices which had to be paid for land, and still more by the heavy rates which had to be paid in order to deal with the problems which these large centres of population created. He need not dwell upon the housing difficulty, but he would say that the private ownership of land upon which large houses, great works, and business premises had to be built, meant a considerable burden upon and was a serious check to private industry. The Resolution would not involve confiscation. They were not suggesting that the local authorities should appropriate the land, but that they should pay for it. He did not think the strongest advocate of the rights of property would suggest that it was the skill and energy of the landlords which had created these values. It was the skill and energy of the community which had created them. The owner of the land might have exercised the faculty of foresight or have been wise enough to select as a father or grandfather somebody who owned land, but the increased wealth was created by the community and they ought not to allow the landowner to step in and take it. There were some cases in which the wealth was clearly purely communal or social, and there were other cases in which the wealth was purely the result of private enterprise; but he ventured to suggest that the growth in land values, in consequence of the growth of population, was not in any sense the result of private enterprise, but was directly the result of the efforts of the community, and was social or communal wealth, which ought to belong to the community at large. He could understand someone saying that the proposed powers would not be used with discretion and judgment, but there was the German example to refer to. There were German towns where they had actually realised the dream which he had indulged in. In regard to some of these towns, they had actually paid all the rates and had a balance to distribute among the fortunate ratepayers. That was not only the case in Germany, but many towns in this country had promoted omnibus Bills under which they had purchased large tracts of land compulsorily and had acquired powers to reclaim, develop and lease them; in those cases the process had been conducted very successfully and a considerable sum of money had been the result. It was not likely that if these powers were granted to local authorities they would enter into competition and become rash speculators. What was proposed was not that county councils or corporations should buy and sell land, going into the market buying one day and selling another, but they wanted them to take the place of the ground landlords and acquire land, hold and lease it for building purposes, the erection of houses, great works, and business premises generally. If the powers were granted they must be exercised in a satisfactory manner, because before a municipality could buy any tract of land they must formulate their scheme, and submit it to the central authority, who would consider whether it was a wise and prudent scheme, whether they were giving a reasonable price, and whether they had a reasonable prospect of making the scheme successful. He would go even further than that, and say that the powers of purchase should be limited to a sum proportionate to the rateable value of the locality. That was not a revolutionary proposal at all; it was a cautious, moderate, and even a conservative scheme, and ought to win the assent of even the most cautious Member of the House. If the cases of any of our large towns were examined, Members would be amazed at the prices paid for sites for police stations, libraries, post offices, and for acquiring open spaces and parks, and for other ordinary public purposes — prices largely in excess of those for which the property could have been purchased a few years earlier. It was not, therefore, a matter of spending enormous sums of money, but of buying land at the right time, from the right person — from the original owner instead of from the land speculator—and at the right price. He ventured to say that if the powers thus conferred were judiciously exercised in the way he had indicated nothing could benefit the general community more, for in such a case the local authority simply became the ground landlord. He would just point out one or two other incidental advantages which would come from such a scheme. It would in the first place steady the price of land in the locality. In growing towns there were alarming and rapid increases of price from the standpoint of the purchaser, although they were very gratifying from the standpoint of the vendor. Those behind the scenes knew that little arrangements were arrived at between the landowners who controlled the market, and they simultaneously raised the price of land. If the proposed power were given to local authorities they could acquire tracts of land, and, fixing the price in a reasonable manner, steady the market and prevent other landowners from charging excessive prices. They could also prevent by compulsion land being held out of the market. That was a very serious difficulty in many districts in the North of England, especially in Lancashire, where towns had been dwarfed and stunted because they could not buy certain estates, and instead of going forward in a natural area of development they had had to find a way round in other directions. If the Resolution were passed it would prevent the holding of land out of the market and the consequent artificial inflation of prices. The House was well aware that it very often happened that settled estates or encumbered estates became ripe for development, but the owners had no capital to make the roads and place the estate on the market. The only way of obtaining capital in such cases was by the introduction of a land syndicate. To the owners of such estates it would be a positive boon to be able to sell to a local authority who could develop them. From the point of view of the owners of many estates, such powers vested in the local authorities would be a great advantage. With regard to the method of purchase, they did not want the Lands Clauses Act method, with the 10 per cent. added for forced sale and disturbance, and its costly machinery of lawyers and surveyors, which enormously increased the cost of the land to be bought. They wanted some simple, rapid, and fair process. The method proposed in the Resolution suggested or assumed an entire revolution in the method of rating. He did not want to wait for that, he wanted power now. He wanted as soon as possible power to buy land by private treaty and to hold it and lease it and develop it for general building purposes. He believed a large part of the problem would be solved if they had that power. But in addition they must have compulsory powers to bring contumacious landlords to book. If such a man knew that if he did not deal he could be made to deal, he would be a more reasonable person to negotiate with. The matter was not entirely a financial one; there were other matters to consider. However successful they might be in bringing the people back to the land the great majority of the people in this country must always be town dwellers, and therefore the towns should be made as healthy, happy, and comfortable as possible. This was largely a children's question. The present condition of some parts of our cities could not but result in the physical and moral deterioration of those who dwelt in them. The machinery he had outlined would, he believed, work an economic revolution in many of our great towns and cities, and he pleaded for its inauguration in the interests of the amenities of our crowded centres, the health of the children, and the moral and material well-being of the community generally. He cordially seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, a measure is urgently needed enabling local authorities to acquire, by agreement or compulsorily, and by simple and inexpensive machinery, such land within or adjoining their several districts as may, in their judgment, be needed for the requirements of the inhabitants; and further that, in all such cases of land acquisition, the purchase price should be definitely based upon the value at which such land is assessed for purposes of taxation."—(*Mr. Toulmin.*)

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he had listened very carefully to the two speeches in support of the Motion, and the first thing that impressed itself on his mind was that the speech of the seconder differed materially from that of the proposer, who had said nothing about safeguards. The beautiful picture of "flowers and trees and green grass" drawn by the mover would not be realised, because the unfortunate ratepayer whose local authority adopted the Resolution would find the rates so high under the ordinary conditions of human life in our towns that he would have to go elsewhere. The substitution of one landlord for another would not prevent overcrowding. The hon. Member had pointed to the prosperity of Liverpool, and claimed that it was due to the corporation's having bought land. But the hon. Gentleman did not complete his argument. He would complete it for him, but the result might not be the same. He would take London as an illustration. London had not bought land of its own, but London was just as prosperous as Liverpool, and the rates in London were no higher than in Liverpool.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.): You ought to have said that during the county council election.

SIR F. BANBURY said that though former governers of Liverpool had purchased land, yet the prosperity of London was as great as the prosperity of Liverpool, and therefore the argument fell to the ground. They could purchase property in London without buying the land, and yet the prosperity of London was just as great as that of the city of Liverpool.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.): What part of London—Poplar or the City?

SIR F. BANBURY said they had to take London as a whole. It was perfectly easy to pick out one isolated part, but that would not answer. It was perfectly easy to take parts of Liverpool and parts of London, but that did not alter his argument in the least. They had to to prove first of all that London was not prosperous and that Liverpool was, and, secondly, that the rates of Liverpool were generally lower than the rates of London. He maintained that they could not do either. The hon. Member had given several instances where local authorities had incurred great expense in buying land, and had said that in some instances there had been a big loss. But that had nothing whatever to do with the power of purchasing land. The hon. Gentleman was not content with revolutionising the system of land purchase, but he wanted also to abolish the lawyer. He did not know whether that would be a good thing or not; he was rather afraid to say that it would be a good thing, because of the proximity of his hon. and learned friend on his left. The question before the House was whether the local authority should have power to enter into land speculation at all, whether it should have more powers than it had at present to acquire land, and whether it was advisable to make those powers compulsory. But in any case would the local authorities be able to obtain sufficient money to carry out the powers given to them? Neither mover nor seconder had alluded to the question of finance. They appeared to think local authorities could raise any amount of money. They were completely wrong. The tremendous growth of the debts of municipal authorities made it impossible to borrow except at greatly increased rates of interest. Were local authorities to buy simply because in 200 years time the land might become valuable? It would be difficult to find a local authority with the business capacity to buy exactly the part of the country which was going to increase in value. Hon. Gentlemen seemed to think that all land was going to increase in value, but local authorities who had bought land in the country thirty or forty years ago would have lost very large sums of money. Land had gone down in value all over the country. Again, what were the possibilities of municipal authorities finding large sums of money at present? The local indebtedness four years ago, excluding Ireland, was £452,000,000, and that did not include the unfunded debt of the municipal authorities. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think that there was magic in big figures, and that the more they were in debt the happier they would be. He had always looked upon the reverse as the truth. [AN HON. MEMBER: 'What about the assets?'] He would deal with that question presently. The local indebtedness of the country had increased between 1893 and 1903 by no less a sum than £73,000,000. The National Nebt was altogether £742,000,000 as against the £452,000,000 of the local authorities, which did not include their unfunded debt. What was the result? Everyone who knew anything about municipal finance knew that at present municipal authorities were unable to borrow in the market, and had borrowed from their bankers to such an extent that the bankers were refusing to advance any more money on any terms at all. They had been obliged to resort to two or three years' bills in the open market, but had exhausted even that supply, and were in an extremely awkward position.

MR. CHIOZZA-MONEY (Paddington, N.) said the clerks of a number of municipal authorities had informed him that those statements were entirely erroneous.

SIR F. BANBURY said he happened to be a director of a bank, and, although he could not reveal secrets, he could assure the hon. Member that the banking accounts of the municipal corporations told quite a different tale, whatever the chief clerks might say. Where was the profit to come in if the municipalities borrowing money at 3½ per cent. bought land at anything like a fair value? At present everybody knew that manufacturers were heavily rated, and it was said that the owner of the land on which the works were built made a profit. It was argued that if the municipality had bought the land on which those factories stood the rates could have been saved. But how could hon. Gentlemen have it both ways? If the ratepayers were going to make the profits that the landlord had made, then the manufacturers must pay just the same as they did now. Did the hon. Member imagine that municipalities could stretch the land? What he evidently meant was that they would put fewer houses upon it, and if they did that they would get less income. If in these land speculations the municipalities found that they could not make a profit, who would lose? Why, the people living in the other part of the town, who would gain nothing by the transaction, but would have to pay the loss incurred by their neighbours living in a better street. If a man was clever and possessed the foresight to buy land advantageously in some particular locality he might make a fortune out of it, but to suppose that the majority of our municipalities would have the foresight to do the same thing was taxing the belief of any ordinary man beyond the bounds of reason. Municipalities would be dealing with other people's money, and consequently they would be inclined to be venturesome. An instructive experience of municipal land-buying was afforded by the late London County Council's investment in land five years ago in the very centre of London. London was a town that was prospering and growing. Yet this experiment on the part of the County Council had resulted in a heavy loss to the ratepayer, for the land was still vacant. In land speculations, to be successful, they wanted to know when to buy and where to buy, and it was easy to be wise after the event. He intended to divide the House against the Resolution.

*MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) said that all those who were interested in social reform realised that the land question was one of the most important which could come under the consideration of the House. Land had been called the mother, and labour the father, of all wealth, and it was because they believed the land question to be indissolubly connected with labour that the Labour Members were particularly pleased that this Resolution had been brought under the consideration of the House. Some people were still of the opinion that the private ownership of land was justifiable, but he thought they would all agree with him when he said that social interests ought to prevail over private concerns. To-day they found that municipalities had great need for land, and the great obstacles to the acquirement of the land necessary for their needs were the landlord, private ownership, and the desire to secure fancy prices. There was a general tendency for towns to spread, and he thought the House would readily admit that that was beneficial to the health and in the best interests of the community as a whole. It was not a pleasant spectacle to see people herded together in the condition they were in at present, and he was very anxious that municipalities should be encouraged to erect houses outside their areas, to provide improved methods of transit, and in that way to improve the health of the community. At present municipalities found the acquisition of land very difficult and complicated, and consequently they were asking for further powers in order that the unearned increment which would naturally accrue as the result of the increase in the population and the development of industry should be devoted to the best interests of the community as a whole, and not be allowed to swell the private profits of the land-owning class. In his opinion it was a wrong thing that people should be able to hold land in order to get fancy prices later on. That kind of extortion made the purchase of land by municipalities prohibitive. They were asking in this Resolution that municipalities should have the power not only to purchase land but to hold it in view of the probable development of a particular district. The hon. Baronet who represented the City of London seemed to think that the rates were the one thing which would alarm the people, but he could assure him that the question of rents was a very serious matter for the working classes. It was well known that the enhanced value extorted by landlords where municipalities had been obliged to acquire land was reflected in higher rents than would otherwise have obtained if the land had been secured at a reasonable figure. The demand for a reform of this state of things did not come from one section of the House only. Speaking on 10th February, 1899, Mr. Asquith propounded what he called "a simple and very intelligible programme," and referring to the first item in that programme, he said—

> "In the first place you ought to give to the local authority of every urban community vastly larger powers than it at present possesses for the compulsory acquisition of land upon terms which would make it possible for the community to employ the land so acquired with advantage to its own interest."

They were glad on that occasion to be in hearty accord with that very sound expression of opinion from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He proposed to show the House how the land question vitally affected the life and health of the people. The question of overcrowding had already been touched upon, and he was fearful that even some hon. Members hardly realised the extent to which that evil prevailed in the country. Nearly one-third of the population lived in an overcrowded condition. In 1904 the Manchester Citizens Aid Association published a valuable Report on the housing conditions in Manchester and Salford, which showed that 34,000 overcrowded persons lived in Manchester, and 16,000 in Salford—a total of 60,000 people. The 1901 census showed that London had 300,000 one-room dwellers. The same census figures showed that in the town groups of Scotland there were not less than a million overcrowded one and two-room dwellers. These figures pointed to a prevalent evil, and he felt that if the municipalities were invested with larger powers of land acquisition it would be a direct encouragement to them to go on with the erection of houses outside their particular areas in order to obviate the evil of overcrowding. As to the health of the community, he felt that they were beginning to understand that that was a question closely related to that of the housing of the people. They had come now to know that in consumption, "The Great White Plague," as Oliver Wendell Holmes called it, we had nature's unmistakable protest against the unnatural conditions under which masses of our people lived. The celebrated German scientist, Dr. Koch, said that—

> "The overcrowded dwellings of the poor are the real breeding-places of tuberculosis;"

that—

> "it is out of them that the disease always crops up anew;"

and that—

> "it is to the abolition of these conditions that we must first and foremost direct our attention if we wish to attack the evil at its root, and to wage war against it with effective weapons."

It was a matter for politicians as well as doctors. Consumption was at bottom a phase of the housing problem, the housing problem was but a phase of the land question. It was not merely an urban question. He believed that in the rural districts something might be done to improve the dwellings of the agricultural population. He thought it was a saddening sight that the agricultural population in some parts were herded into little huts into which many people would not put their dogs or pet animals, while thousands of acres of land were lying idle. A few months ago, through the caprice of a landlord, a relative of his own, an agricultural labourer, received notice to quit his little house, and there was no possibility of securing shelter for his domestic chattels from one end of the town to the other, and yet all around the town there were many acres of land lying idle. The local council had no power to acquire that land in order that the people might be housed. He was glad that the latter part of the Resolution indicated a basis on which such land might be purchased. There were cases which showed how municipalities had been subject to great extortion at the hands of landlords. The Corporation of Leeds some time ago had to purchase from Lord Masham 400 acres. The rateable value of the land was £6,000; the price asked was £196,000; and the price awarded was £46,000. It might be said that, after all, Lord Masham was simply a good business man. Admitting that, he wished to see the municipality exercising equal business capacity on behalf of the community. The Government had occasion some years ago to buy some land from Sir Michael Hicks Beach, now Lord St. Aldwyn. The price demanded and ultimately received was eighty years purchase. He felt that no land reformer advocating a scheme of land purchase would ever give countenance to such an exorbitant price.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) asked whether the hon. Member was aware that the case was submitted to arbitration. It was not a question of extortion.

*MR. GEORGE ROBERTS said he was not concerned whether it was submitted to arbitration or not. He was concerned with the basis of the purchase, and he respectfully submitted that eighty years purchase was a most extortionate price for the nation to have to pay. The Admiralty paid eighty years purchase for land acquired at Rosyth. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham told a Parliamentary Committee that the land acquired by the Birmingham Corporation for the Corporation Street improvement cost £400,000 more than it ought to have done. Mr. S. Laing had estimated that landlords had extorted many millions over the value of the land appropriated to railway purposes. Interest, of course, had to be earned on that capital, and that must reflect itself in the rates charged for transit as well as on the wages of the workers. If municipalities had the power to hold land, they might be able to carry out useful experiments during periods of acute unemployment. He thought the shopkeeper of London pursued a short-sighted policy during the recent County Council election, because whilst the landlords were able to extort in the shape of rent one-third, and in some cases one-half the wages of the workers, it necessarily followed that those workers had much less to spend on the other necessaries of life.

DR. MACNAMARA thought the Motion touched one of the most acute and urgent of the many problems which confronted social reformers. Whether they considered rural depopulation, overcrowding in the great towns, lack of employment, physical deterioration, or, indeed, any one of the dozen other social and economic problems, they found themselves at an early stage of their investigation getting back to the land every time. Perhaps the House would allow him to state how the local authorities stood in respect of the power of compulsorily acquiring land. At the present time local authorities could only acquire land compulsorily for some specific and immediate purpose connected with the performance of their statutory duties. Generally speaking, all local authorities could acquire land under compulsion for carrying out the obligations statutorily laid on them. Except in certain cases, such as electric operations and operations under the Burial Acts, land could be acquired under compulsion. All local authorities, except county councils and parish councils, could compulsorily acquire land under the Public Health Act of 1875; but in that case the Provisional Order must be confirmed by Parliament. All local authorities, except parish councils, could compulsorily acquire land under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890. Rural district councils could not acquire land compulsorily under Part 1 of the Act; but in all other cases, if the Provisional Order was not opposed it could be sanctioned by the Local Government Board. He ought to add that in all operations under Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, the Provisional Order must be sanctioned by Parliament whether opposed or not. Parish councils under the Local Government Act of 1894 might acquire under compulsion land for burial grounds, public libraries, allotments, recreation grounds, parish rooms, and so on; but in these cases the Provisional Order was secured from the county council and confirmed by the Local

Government Board. That was a very short statement of the existing law. As he had said, at present a local authority could only acquire land for some specific and immediate purpose connected with the performance of its statutory duties. Further, a local authority had no power to apply land which it had acquired for one purpose to another purpose inconsistent with the original purpose, although it might be no longer possible to use the land in the way originally intended. In that case, indeed, it appeared to be the primary duty of the local authority under the Lands Clauses Act and Section 175 of the Public Health Act of 1875 to dispose of any land found to be superfluous for the immediate purposes for which it was purchased. From an urban point of view some local authorities naturally enough, especially big urban authorities, complained that in the existing state of the law they were debarred from seizing favourable opportunities for acquiring, at a moderate price, land in the suburbs of their district that might ultimately be required for public purposes, and were compelled to wait until the need for the land had actually arisen, by which time, owing to various causes, such as the increase of population or improvements effected by the local authorities themselves, the value of the property had become advanced. The Town Council of Sheffield a few months since invited other town councils to join in a representation to the effect that these bodies should be enabled to acquire land, when they found suitable opportunities for so doing, and to have adequate borrowing powers without at the same time stating definitely for what particular purpose the land should be used. He understood that forty municipalities joined in that representation. That was the position of the great municipal authorities. But let them take the rural side of the problem. The House had had before it within the last two or three weeks two very remarkable Reports by Select Committees. The first was the Report of the Rural Housing Select Committee, which was presided over by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chippenhan. That Committee reported—

> "No reform in connection with rural housing can be of any effective use unless further facilities for the acquisition of land are given."

Dr. Macnamara.

And then they went on to say that—

> "Machinery under the Housing Acts for the compulsory acquisition of land is very complicated."

And they further pointed out that—

> "Local authorities will often be prepared to pay more than the market value for the land required rather than undergo the uncertainty and delay which a resort to compulsory powers now involves."

They added—

> "No solution will be satisfactory which does not enable local authorities to purchase land compulsorily for any public purpose, including housing, drainage, small holdings, etc., upon a basis of its rateable value."

The principal conclusion of this Rural Housing Committee was that the difficulty of obtaining land was one of the chief causes for rural depopulation. From that they passed to a very significant association between rural depopulation and the problem of town unemployment. The Report set forth that—

> "The Committee have had evidence to show that the greater proportion of persons in distressed circumstances in London and the larger provincial towns—the unemployed and the unemployable—are town bred and not country bred . . . . Out of nearly 10,000 men out of work or in irregular casual employment, as found in Salvation Army and Church Army houses and shelters and in Rowton Houses by the distress committees, and amongst dock labourers, the percentage of town bred men ranged from 86 to 94 per cent. On the other hand, out of the total number of men employed in a selected number of larger undertakings and industries such as the Post Office, police, municipal service, railways, gas works, breweries, stores, etc, early in the year 1906, 46 per cent. were country born."

They arrived at the conclusion, first that rural depopulation sprang, to some extent, from the land problem; and, secondly, that unemployment in towns sprang to some extent out of rural depopulation. The land problem, therefore, and unemployment were very far from being entirely unconnected. He was bound to say, as he had listened to heated discussions in the House on the application of a few thousand pounds for the immediate mitigation of hardship due to unemployment, he had often felt that the real problem before them was the slow and painful process of removing causes of unemployment by wise measures of social reform, not the least amongst which was the serious overhauling of the land problem. Still on the rural side, there was a remarkable Report recently laid upon the Table by the Select Committee on Small Holdings, of which Lord Onslow was Chairman. That Committee made two prime recommendations. First they said—

"That in addition to the machinery provided by the Small Holdings Act, 1892, the provision of small holdings should be assisted by the direct intervention of a central Government Department."

And they added that—

"In the event of the central Government Department, the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, being unable to obtain by agreement land required for these operations compulsory powers should be conferred."

The hon. Member for Leith Burghs made an interesting reservation to the recommendations generally, in the course of which he said—

"It would indeed be an immense advantage were urban communities owners of adjacent lands like the ancient burghs of Scotland and the modern cities of Germany. The use of such land by the urban population, as in France, is with us comparatively unknown, and were the council landowner, with a regular estate policy, all communal interests in cultivation, administration, and revenue would best be served. This simple and effective machinery, while securing existing rights subject only to expropriation where necessary, would amply secure the public interest."

This interesting reference induced him to look abroad for a moment. The House was aware of the fact that for some years many German towns had adopted the policy of steadily acquiring land, and the success of the policy was so marked that a few years ago the Prussian Government issued a rescript to provincial governors to use all their influence to induce all Prussian towns to extend the policy. At the close of 1902, the area of land owned by thirty-one large towns varied from ten to 365 square yards per head of the population. Only seven in the thirty-one had less than twenty-four square yards per head; six had from twenty-four to sixty; nine had from sixty to 120—Berlin had eighty-five—five had from 120 to 240, and four had over 240 square yards per head. Since 1902 nearly all these towns had actively increased their holding. In 1892 there was a very interesting inquiry instituted in certain parts of Germany as to land owned by townships, big or little. The Burgomaster of Treis on the Moselle wrote—

"The Burgomastery of Treis consists of an area of 25,000 acres. Of these more than 12,500 acres belong to the parishes. All local needs are met from the common purse. Then each burgher receives his firing on payment of half or one-third of its value, and twenty-five to thirty acres of cultivable land for his lifetime."

Sigmaringen (Hohenzollern), a place of about 200 households, had 1,050 acres of wood and 1,650 acres of meadow and cultivable land. The current local taxes were covered from the revenue, a sum of £63 was given for common purposes, a sum of £133 was devoted to paying the State taxes of the burghers, and 1,700 cubic metres of firewood were divided among them. Phillipsburg (Baden), with 2,400 inhabitants, had 1,017½ acres of wood and 1,285 acres of meadow and cultivated fields. Görlitz (Schlesia) a town of 83,700 people, owned 77,127½ acres from which in 1892 £33,028 went to common fund. Enkirch on the Moselle with 2,200 inhabitants had about 5,000 acres of land, wood, heath, underwood, and cultivable land. Mixtadt in Posen, in the district of Adelnau, with 3,000 inhabitants, possessed about 1,875 acres of land and had no local rates. He presented this case to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and he hoped it would commend itself to them, as they were always so solicitous about the downtrodden ratepayer. He passed from this picture to the state of affairs at home. On 12th January at Newcastle-on-Tyne Viscount Ridley, speaking at a farmers' club, told them that—

"Not far from one-third of the land of the country is owned by the House of Lords in one way or another."

He wondered whether the noble Lord thought that such a state of things as that statement represented could really long continue. To his mind it represented all the dangerously unstable equilibrium of an inverted pyramid. Passing to the Resolution before the House, the proposition was that there should be increased power for the compulsory acquisition of land. The Government agreed to that proposition. It was a weighty experiment, and would have to be carefully safeguarded. Nobody desired that the local authorities should become mere speculators on the security of the rates. But the compulsory acquirement of land for the public well-being was part of the Government's policy. He dared say the cry of confiscation would be raised. It was always raised by those who were doubtful about the validity of their title deeds. But he was glad that his hon. friends the mover and seconder laid stress on the fact that there was no shadow of confiscation in their policy. They all desired to pay a fair price for what they wished to secure for the public well-being, and that, of course, must always be the bed-rock of any policy involving a scheme of expropriation. The last part of the Resolution said that in all cases of land acquisition the purchase price should be definitely based upon the value at which such land was assessed for purposes of taxation. He understood the mover had in contemplation not the existing system of local taxation but the assessment which would be set up under the Valuation Bill announced in the gracious Speech from the Throne. There could be no doubt that, as the law now stood, the value at which land was assessed for purposes of local taxation would not provide a fair purchase price. On the other hand, the present practice of assessing the value in cases of compulsory acquisition was most unfair in many cases to the local authorities. He remembered that the present Lord Advocate for Scotland, speaking in the House on the 27th of March, 1903, on the Land Values Assessment and Rating Bill, quoted two interesting cases from Edinburgh. He said—

> "There was a little block of land near the city forty-five acres in extent which the Water Trust sometime ago wanted for the purpose of forming filtering beds. Now the value of that land at thirty years purchase of the existing rent was £4,387, but when it was wanted for this public and necessary purpose the owner charged for it £20,000, or at the rate of 136 years purchase....There was another transaction, this time between the Town Council of Edinburgh and the Duke of Buccleuch. The city required land for the purpose of erecting new gas works in the neighbourhood of Granton but within the territory of the borough. The ground extended to 105 acres and it was partly built upon, but the average price at which it was rated was £5 10s 0d. per acre. At thirty years purchase the amount would be £165 per acre, or a total value for the ground of £17,300. How much had the City of Edinburgh to pay for that ground? No less than £124,000, or 212 years purchase of the rating value."

With facts like those before them they could not but say that the present practice of assessing the value in cases of compulsory acquisition was most unfair in cases to the local authorities. The new system of valuation in the promised Bill would, he hoped, provide them with a definite basis upon which to work. But he would go the length of saying that he did not think even then they could take that wholly and exclusively as the basis upon which that transfer should be made. As far as he could see, having got this new Valuation Bill, and the new valuation, their duty would then be to see that the assessment of land taxation should be a very material item indeed—not necessarily the sole item—in giving them the basis for determining the price of expropriation. In that sense, and on that understanding, he could adopt the general proposition put forward in the Resolution of his hon. friend.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that throughout the debate there had been a disposition entirely to ignore the extremely large contributions made of their own free will by owners of land for the benefit and advancement of the happiness of the dwellers on the properties with which they had to do, and the fact that many of the most valuable public properties in this country had been presented free by generous landlords. He thought it was a pity, when these subjects were talked about, that they should hear of the "tyranny of the landlord" in refusing to rebuild buildings, when no attempt was made to show that there could be any real right or claim upon him to do so. An hon. Member on the Labour Benches had spoken of the "huts in which the rural population was herded." The huts in which the agricultural labourers lived on the land which he was interested in cost him, as a landlord, some £250 a piece, and paid him in rent £2 10s. a year. It was said that it would be a beneficial thing if municipalities speculated in land. He had his doubts. He doubted whether it was economically sound or whether it was good for the ratepayers or the welfare of the population within the municipal districts where the speculation took place. The financial aspect of the question had been dealt with by his hon. friend the Member for the City of London. No attempt had been made on the other side of the House to reply to that economic and financial argument. He would venture to deal with the speech of the hon. Gentleman who represented the Government on this occasion. Of course one was interested in the line which he took, but one had not been able to help making a comment or two to oneself in the course of his remarks. The hon. Gentleman had held up to them Germany and France as examples of letting land around urban areas to semi-rural cultivators; but let him remind the hon. Gentleman that it was conceivably possible that any advantage which accrued to that semi-rural population might arise from the fact that rural industries there had a better chance, because they were carried on in countries in which a different fiscal system obtained from what we had in this country. Moreover, the urban authorities in Germany would probably not have ventured to make those investments in land had it not been for the fiscal arrangements under which they acted. No doubt in the legislation which the hon. Gentleman had shadowed forth he would be able to devise some arrangement which would make ownership of land more profitable than it could possibly be under present conditions. The hon. Gentleman had referred to a remark of Lord Ridley as to the ownership of land, and as to the large amount of land owned by Peers in this country; but the question did not depend on who owned the land, but on the use to which the land was put by those who were on it. If he was right in his contention, he believed that, broadly speaking, the owners of the land had used it well, wisely, generously, and farsightedly for the benefit of the whole of the community, and the fact that it was owned by one particular section did not come within the purview of this Resolution. The hon. Gentleman said he thought people only talked of confiscation when they were afraid of the validity of their title deeds: he could hardly have been serious in that. But the essence and pith of the Resolution was contained in the closing clause—

> "The purchase price should be definitely based upon the value at which such land is assessed for purposes of taxation."

He rather fancied that if those words were deleted, the Resolution would be of comparatively little value to the mover or to those who supported it; yet that was the absolutely logical result of the speech of the hon. Gentleman representing the Government. It was suggested that the value of the land should be fixed definitely according to its assessment for purposes of taxation. Let them assume that a certain portion of land was notoriously likely to be valuable in the immediate future, that that land formed part of an estate, and that on that estate there were certain family charges or certain mortgages; nobody would suggest that those charges or mortgages had any relation whatever to the assessed value of that land. Those charges had been placed on the land entirely with reference to the economic value, that was to say the price which the land would fetch if it were put up to public auction in the circumstances in which land was sold now. He did not suppose he was very far out when he said that land which might be let for £100 a year might be mortgaged for many thousands. But he only said that to fortify the position which the hon. Gentleman had taken up. It was quite clear, therefore, on the hon. Gentleman's own showing that the Resolution could not be supported except as an abstract proposition which was not intended to be pressed to any practical issue. In such cases as had been sketched by the mover and seconder, he thought that a good many of them would have great sympathy with those affected. They spoke of a circumvallation of the town caused by the absolute refusal of the owner to sell his land. If that were the true condition of things he would have a good deal of sympathy with those who complained of it. Did the hon. Member really think that there were in England many such instances as he had cited? He doubted it very much. He thought they were cases which were largely used for platform purposes, or to win cheers or votes. He did not think they existed in any number, if at all. If hon. Members were going to discuss the question in a spirit of justice and fair play, he would ask them to remember that the legitimate and rightful owners of the land had also some claim to consideration, and something more than consideration, as well as the municipal authorities who were to acquire the land. Supposing that the land had been perfectly legitimately acquired by the owner, who had been perhaps rather more far-sighted than his municipal neighbours, what was going to be done in such a case? As far as he could judge of the argument of the hon. Gentleman, it was that if the private owner had exercised foresight and wisdom in the purchase of land, he was not to be allowed to reap the benefit of his foresight and calculation. Not only would they deprive the owner of his harvest, due to his own foresight and enterprise, but they would put the municipality in a position to reap the full benefit of that harvest whenever it came. He could not speak of urban districts with any particular knowledge, but those who had the good fortune to live in the country and enjoy it were not likely to be backward in sympathising with their fellow-creatures who were placed in a less happy position, and there was much in the Resolution with which many on his side of the House agreed. If it was true that there was need to acquire land for public purposes, let them leave out "compulsorily," and say "by agreement." He knew that would not suit hon. Members opposite, for in the minds of some people it was not possible to do good to one class without doing harm to another. Reference had been made to the necessity of providing simple and inexpensive machinery for the acquisition of land. He might say that any reform of that kind would have the support of all landowners, but the closing part of the Resolution suggested what was practically absolute confiscation and spoliation, and, therefore, he would go into the lobby against it.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) moved to amend the Resolution by providing that the purchase price of land sought to be acquired should be "based upon a fair valuation." He believed that if his hon. friend would accept the Amendment his Motion would be agreed to unanimously by the House. They were all agreed that it was desirable that local authorities should be saved a great deal of the unnecessary expense they now had to incur when they wanted to acquire land for local purposes. He was afraid, however, that the mover of the Resolution had in his mind something very different, and there appeared to be behind the proposal an advocacy of the taxation of land values and the confiscation of what was called the unearned increment. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board had taken a somewhat curious line. He had explained that it was impossible for the Government to accept the last words of the Resolution as it stood, and he had ended by saying that according to his own interpretation of them they could accept them. The words of the Resolution as they stood were absolutely intolerable. The price to be paid for the land should be "definitely fixed upon the value at which such land is assessed for purposes of taxation." That was intolerable. A man bought a small holding near a town, paying a high price for it, upon the expectation the value would increase. Meanwhile, he used it as a market garden and was properly taxed for a market garden. The mover of the Resolution proposed to take away that man's land paying him only market-garden value and not the higher price he had paid for it. That was absolute confiscation, whether applied to a rich man or to a poor man. What power that would give to local authorities to be dishonest! They could raise their rates and lower the assessment, taking the land on their own valuation. They could thus confiscate any land they wished. Why should local authorities be credited always with the foresight to know when land was going to rise in value? As a matter of fact, nothing was more difficult than to foresee how land was going to rise in value. He would quote the very striking case of the school in which he was educated, a school founded in the reign of Edward VI. by a citizen of London, Sir Andrew Judd. In his will Sir Andrew left the school a large strip of land in the neighbourhood of Tonbridge. Subsequently he thought he had left the school too much, and he changed his will, took away from the school the piece of land near Tonbridge, which he then left to his relations, and left to the school instead a smaller piece of land in London on which St. Pancras Station now stood. He believed his hon. friend was a business man; if he and other business men believed that land was always going to rise in value, why did not they take money out of their business and buy land with it? The answer was that in practice there was no more certainty in land speculation than in any other speculation, and the chance of loss in land speculation was a very heavy one. He argued that self-assessment would be unworkable. His object in moving the Amendment was to remove from the Motion all traces of confiscation. Hon. Members who supported the Motion believed that, by giving larger power to the municipalities, they would improve the social condition of the country. To a large extent he agreed with them. But surely they should not base a public advantage on a private wrong.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) in seconding the Amendment said that to take land and base the purchase price upon the value at which such land was assessed for the purposes of taxation would be absolutely indefensible.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to leave out from the word 'be' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'based upon a fair valuation.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided: Ayes, 172; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 102.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Clough, William
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Trevelyan, Charles Phillips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (S'thampton)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer

Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Toulmin and Mr. Walters.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt HnSirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie,H.T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bright, J. A.
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crossley, William J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber,Capt.W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill,Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col.W.
Lambton,Hon.Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Nield, Herbert
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Rutherford, W. W (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Harold Cox and Lord Robert Cecil.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) rose to continue the debate,

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Postponed proceeding on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the force of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof, resumed.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

SUPPLY [8TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th April], "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the Resolution, 'That a sum not exceeding £91,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens.'"

Question again proposed.

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY [8TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for Consideration of Ninth and Tenth Resolutions.

Resolutions agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden), in moving the Adjournment of the House, gave notice that the Prime Minister would to-morrow move the suspension of the Eleven o'clock rule.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somerset, Wellington) thought it might be for the convenience of the House for him to say that, if that Resolution were carried, the sitting to-morrow was likely to be peculiarly long.

Adjourned at a Quarter after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 11*th April*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Brockenhurst Gas Bill (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed.

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed.

Maidstone Gas Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill (by Order), Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway (General Powers) Bill (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Railway Bills (Group 2).—Mr. Soames reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Wednesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Byrne's Divorce Bill (Lords].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, with Minutes of Proceedings; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

FitzGerald's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, with Minutes of Proceedings; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Galwey's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, with Minutes of Proccedings; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Galwey's Divorce Bill [Lords], Fitz-Gerald's Divorce Bill [Lords], and Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings in the House of Lords on the Second Reading of Galwey's Divorce Bill [Lords], Fitz-Gerald's Divorce Bill [Lords], and Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords], together with the Documents deposited in each case, be returned to the House of Lords; and that the Clerk do carry the same.—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour;—From Billinge; Bryn; Conduit; Dillwyn; Gallihir; Garswood Hall; Haydock; Lancashire, Cheshire, and North Wales Enginemen and Boilermen; Netherburn; New Foundation; Newtown; New Winnings; Onllwyr; Pinxton; South Normanton; Stonehouse; Walkden; and, Wyndham Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Alloa; Alva; Auchterarder; Castletown; Congregational Union of Scotland; Dalmuir West; Edinburgh (four); Falkirk; Glasgow: Greenock (four); Lauder; Methil; Port Glasgow; Renfrew; Sanquhar; and, Windgyates; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (CONTRACTS) BILL.

Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th February; *Mr. Rothschild*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 105.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Statement showing the amount of the Special Grants paid during the financial year 1906–7 in aid of certain Local Education Authorities in England and Wales [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC RECORDS.

Copy presented, of Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Ipswich and the Urban District Council of Wallasey, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL OBSERVATORY (EDINBURGH).

Copy presented, of Seventeenth Annual Report of the Astronomer Royal for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

HOMICIDE (PUNISHMENT IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Address for "Return of the various Punishments for Homicidal Crime provided by the penal codes of the following Countries, viz.: France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Portugal, Russia, and the United States of America."—(*Mr. George Greenwood.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Welsh Private Bill Legislation.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Prime Minister whether he can now give the terms of the Amendment to the Standing Orders that he proposes to move with a view to meeting the request of Welsh Members that all the representatives of Welsh constituencies shall be placed on any Committee to which Bills relating exclusively to Wales and Monmouthshire may be remitted; and when the proposed Amendment will be placed upon the Notice Paper.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) There are already Amendments on the Paper with this object, and when they are reached the views of the Government will be stated.

Exchequer and Audit Department.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Comptroller and Auditor-General, the Assistant Comptroller, or any of their subordinate chiefs, have the right to question any of their subordinates regarding private communications on the administration of the Exchequer and Audit Department that may have passed between any of such subordinates and a Member of Parliament; whether the right exists to question any of such subordinates regarding his acquaintanceship with any Member of Parliament, and, if so, seeing that the whole staff of the Exchequer and Audit Department is composed of public servants paid out of public funds, will he explain under what authority or regulation such rights are claimed.

(*Answered by Mr. Runicman.*) In view of cases which have recently occurred in which information derived from official sources has been communicated without authority to the public Press and other persons, the Comptroller and Auditor-General has drawn the attention of his staff to the general rule in force throughout the Civil Service that such action will be considered a grave breach of duty, rendering the offender in extreme cases liable to dismissal.

Sugar Duties.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the sugar duties on fruit pulp at present operate protectively in favour of the British jam manufacturer; and whether it is his intention to bring this industry into line with the free trade policy of the present Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) No, Sir, nor, so far as I am aware, is there any foundation for the suggestion that such is their effect. Fruit pulp, other than pulp chargeable with the fruit duty, is liable to duty only in respect of the amount of sugar added.

Irish Land Purchase Loans.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether fresh borrowing for Irish land purchase is taking place at about the cost of £3 3s. 3d. per hundred pounds, which is more than the price at which Consols are being redeemed with the Sinking Fund; and whether he can see his way to changing this system.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The last issue of guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Stock was made at the price of eighty-nine, giving a yield of £3 1s. 9d. per cent. I am aware that this rate is higher than the yield of Consols at their present price, but I know no better way to improve the price of the Guaranteed Stock than by the application of Sinking Fund to the reduction of the National Debt.

Old Age Pensions.

CAPTAIN FABER: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in considering the subject of old-age pensions, he will consult the Secretary of State for War as to the advisability of commencing with those who have served for a certain period in His Majesty's Auxiliary Forces, and thus stimulate the desire to serve voluntarily in the Territorial Army.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I do not think it would be practicable to adopt the hon. and gallant Member's suggestion.

Income Tax.

MR. BILLSON (Staffordshire, N.W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can give an approximate estimate of the cost to the Revenue of separately assessing for abatement the several incomes of man and wife.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Board of Inland Revenue have no materials for forming such an estimate.

Civil Pensions.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness, Burghs): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, seeing that the Treasury has no power as the law now stands to include Army or Navy service in the calculation of civil pensions, he will consider the question of the introduction of a measure to confer upon it such power.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The conditions of military and naval service are so different from those attaching to the Civil Service of the State that I think it would be undesirable to make the change suggested by my hon. friend.

Japanese Pharmacopœia.

MR. GODDARD CLARKE (Camberwell, Peckham): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is aware that, in consequence of the publication of a new edition of the Japanese Pharmacopœia and the proposed enforcement of the standards of that work upon imports of chemicals and drugs into the Japanese Empire on and after 1st July, 1907, manufacturers and merchants of Great Britain are being put to trade inconvenience and loss, as the Pharmacopœia is only obtainable in the Japanese language, and no official translation of it in a European or classic language is available; and will he take steps to secure the postponement of the importation order until such period as the English translation of the Pharmacopœia has been published and the new standards are in consequence known to manufacturers and merchants in this country.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Grey.*) My attention has already been drawn to this matter and inquiries will be made at Tokio. Should the facts be as stated His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires will be instructed to ask the Japanese Government to allow an extension of time.

Recruitment of Native Labour in Portuguese East Africa.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the proposed Anglo-Portuguese Commission for inquiring into the recruiting of natives in Portuguese East Africa has been abandoned; if so, whether he can state the reasons for its abandonment; and whether any other Commission will take its place.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Yes, Sir. The new Transvaal Government do not wish to proceed with it. They are appointing a Transvaal Commission to inquire into and report on the whole question of the recruitment of native labour in South Africa, and hope that a speedier settlement of the matter may be reached in this way.

Crown Agents' Contracts.

Mr. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Crown Agents for the Colonies issue any information as to the results of manufacturers' tenders, and as to the names of the successful tenderers, in cases where the contracts tendered for are placed by the Crown Agents.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Crown Agents for the Colonies follow the practice of Government Departments by treating tenders as strictly confidential.

Sir Alexander Swettenham.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state when the Papers connected with the resignation of Sir Alexander Swettenham will be in the hands of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I cannot give a positive Answer, but Papers will probably be presented to the House in the course of next week.

Customs Assistant Clerks.

Mr. THORNTON (Clapham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a petition from the new class of assistant clerks in the Statistical Department of the Customs has been received at the Treasury; and, if so, what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) This petition is still under consideration.

Customs Senior Assistant Clerks.

Mr. THORNTON: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that several of the senior assistant clerks have reached the maximum salary of their class, £150; and whether, having regard to the ages of the men concerned, he can hold out any prospect of an early improvement in their position.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) In the Customs Department there are twenty-six senior assistant clerks who have reached the maximum salary (£150) of their class. Their ages vary from forty to sixty-four years, the average age being forty-eight. Sixteen of the twenty-six are in receipt of an allowance of £30 per annum in addition to their maximum salary. I can hold out no prospect of acceleration of promotion for these men, if that is what the hon. Member has in his mind.

Mr. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the average number of hours extra duty per man performed by assistant clerks in the Statistical Office of His Majesty's Customs during the year 1906; and how much of such extra duty was compulsory.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that the average number of hours of extra duty per man performed by assistant clerks in the Statistical Office of the Customs Department during the year 1906 was 374. During 182 of these hours attendance was compulsory owing to the necessity for the early publication of the Monthly Trade Returns. During 108 hours (included in the 374 mentioned above) attendance was given for the preparation of the Annual Statement of Trade. This attendance was to some extent compulsory, but the wishes of the clerks are met as far as possible. I understand that there is no difficulty in obtaining attendance.

Central Telegraph Office—Employment of Ex-Soldiers.

Mr. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that ex-soldiers have been given employment as telegraphists in the Central Telegraph Office, and have been paid commencing wages of 24s. per week, although being considerably over twenty-five years of age; whether he will state the salary that men, entering as learners and proceeding up the scale in the usual way, would receive at the same age as the ex-soldiers recently introduced; and whether he will state the reason for using the services of ex-soldiers to depress the standard of telegraphists' wages by employing them at a much smaller salary than the scale advertised by the Civil Service Commissioners when announcing open competitive examinations.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) As the hon. Gentleman is aware for many years past the Post Office has been bound to reserve a certain proportion of vacancies in certain grades of Post Office employment for ex-soldiers and ex-sailors, which has much restricted the openings for ex-telegraph messengers. Under a recent arrangement with the War Office, while the number of vacancies allotted to ex-soldiers and ex-sailors will in no way be increased, the Postmaster-General will have a freer hand in deciding what particular places shall be filled by them, thus enabling him to set free a larger number of vacancies to be filled by ex-telegraph messengers. As regards the ex-soldiers in question, the pay of 24s. given to them is merely probationary, and designed to support them while they are in the position of learners. The men are well aware that in due course they will, if they give complete satisfaction, be appointed to the establishment as telegraphists, and the point at which they enter the ordinary scale will then be fixed according to their experience and qualifications, and the value of their services. There is no question of placing them on a different scale from that in force for telegraphists in general.

Kilmarnock Court House.

Mr. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been drawn to the claim which has repeatedly been made through his department by the county council of Ayrshire against the Treasury for a grant under the Sheriff Court Houses Act in respect of alterations and improvements carried out at the Kilmarnock Court House; what is the reason for the prolonged delay; and when will a settlement be arrived at.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Treasury have intimated a grant of £479 15s. 1d., but as there is still a small amount at issue, a final settlement has not been reached.

Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks.

Mr. REMNANT: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that for a number of years the total withdrawals have exceeded the deposits in the case of Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks; and if he can explain this fact.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The following Statements show, for the last ten years, the deposits and withdrawals in the case of the Post Office Savings Bank and the Trustee Savings Banks. As regards the Post Office Savings Bank, it will be seen that only in the years 1903 and 1904 have the withdrawals exceeded the deposits, while in the case of the Trustee Savings Banks there has been an excess of withdrawals in each of the last seven years. I am disposed to consider that the withdrawals may in great part be attributed to investments in Government stock, or other securities yielding a better rate of interest than 2½ per cent. for £100 cash. The position, however, is not so unfavourable as the hon. Member's Question seems to suggest, for, if the interest earned by the depositor be taken into account, both funds show a continuous increase over the period, except for the Trustee Savings Banks in the year 1904.

(1) Post Office Savings Bank.

Year.	Deposits.	Withdrawals.	Excess of Deposits +, or Excess of Withdrawals —.	Amount due to Depositors at close of Year.
	£	£	£	£
1897 -	35,757,476	30,624,995	+5,132,481	115,896,786
1898 -	37,361,838	32,952,829	+4,409,009	123,144,099
1899 -	39,122,160	35,171,475	+3,950,685	130,118,605
1900 -	40,516,434	38,231,372	+2,285,062	135,549,645
1901 -	41,452,051	39,890,043	+1,562,008	140,392,916
1902 -	42,217,003	41,395,800	+ 821,203	144,605,088
1903 -	40,857,206	42,786,025	-1,928,819	146,135,147
1904 -	40,612,967	41,904,393	-1,291,426	148,339,354
1905 -	42,300,617	42,096,037	+ 204,580	152,111,140
1906 (estimated) -	43,981,000	43,804,500	+ 176,500	155,957,000

(2) Trustee Savings Banks.

Year.	Deposits.	Withdrawals.	Excess of Deposits +, or Excess of Withdrawals —.	Amount due to Depositors at close of Year.
	£	£	£	£
1897 -	12,015,556	11,415,156	+ 600,400	48,464,797
1898 -	12,244,176	11,917,209	+ 326,967	49,995,372
1899 -	12,737,645	12,569,951	+ 167,694	51,404,929
1900 -	12,247,672	13,448,957	-1,201,285	51,455,917
1901 -	12,489,513	13,251,630	- 762,117	51,966,386
1902 -	12,805,185	13,559,498	- 754,313	52,505,081
1903 -	12,712,892	13,981,749	-1,268,857	52,540,339
1904 -	12,560,322	14,120,730	-1,560,408	52,280,857
1905 -	13,218,125	14,083,437	- 865,312	52,723,436
1906 -	13,408,810	14,442,412	-1,033,602	53,009,299

Bengal Opium.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India, what was the number of chests of Bengal opium remaining in store in India and available for export on the 31st March, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The number of chests of Bengal opium available for export which was in store on the 31st March last was 72,000 in round figures. The precise number is not yet available.

Snake Poisoning in India.

Sir W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India what have been the total number of deaths and the death rates per million living from snake poisoning in India for each year for the last thirty years; and what measures, curative or preventive, are provided or encouraged by the Government of India with a view to reduce the mortality from snake venom.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The reported number of deaths and the death rate from snake bite in India during each of the last thirty years are as follows—

Year.	Number of Deaths from Snake Poisoning.	Population according to last Census.	Death Rate per Million Living.
1876	15,819	185,163,353	85·4
1877	16,723	,,	90·3
1878	16,740	,,	90·4
1879	17,266	,,	93·2
1880	19,150	,,	103·4
1881	18,670	199,103,821	93·8
1882	19,519	,,	98·0
1883	20,067	,,	100·9
1884	19,629	,,	98·6
1885	20,142	,,	101·2
1886	22,134	,,	111·2
1887	19,739	,,	99·1
1888	20,571	,,	103·3
1889	22,480	,,	112·9
1890	21,412	,,	107·5
1891	21,389	221,239,515	96·7
1892	19,025	,,	86·0
1893	21,213	,,	95·9
1894	21,556	,,	97·4
1895	22,086	,,	99·4
1896	21,000	,,	94·9
1897	20,959	,,	94·7
1898	21,901	,,	99·0
1899	24,621	,,	111·3
1900	22,393	,,	100·8
1901	22,810	231,899,507	98·4
1902	23,167	,,	99·9
1903	21,827	,,	94·1
1904	21,880	,,	94·3
1905	21,797	,,	94·0

The Returns are probably not very accurate, as they are based on unskilled diagnosis. Rewards are offered in most provinces for the destruction of snakes, but experience has shown that this measure is not likely to have any appreciable effect on the mortality from snake bite, and the total amounts so paid are small. The medical officers employed at the research laboratories in India are engaged in investigating and testing the anti-venomous sera or other curative agents which have been suggested, and a system of treatment of affected persons by permanganate of potash, suggested by Sir Lauder Brunton, is being tried in some provinces.

Dublin Housing Difficulty.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has seen the reply of Earl Carysfort's agent to the deputation from the Kingstown Urban District Council; whether he has received a copy of the resolutions passed at a public meeting held in Glasthule on the 7th April; and whether he can state what measures the Irish Government will take to preserve the people in their homes until better dwellings are provided.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have read a newspaper report of the proceedings of the Kingstown Urban District Council on 4th April, when the Chairman of the Public Health Committee stated the purport of the reply given by the Earl of Carysfort's agent to the deputation from the council which waited on him. I have also received the resolutions passed by the meeting at Glasthule. I explained to the hon. Member in my Answer to his Question on 22nd March that the Local Government Board have no power to intervene in the matter of the closing of these houses, which is one for the urban council to deal with so far as their powers enable them to do so. I gather from the newspaper report to which I have referred that there is reason to hope that steps will be taken to provide proper housing accommodation for the persons affected.

Higher Education in Ireland.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is his intention to introduce legislation this session in connection with higher education, as outlined by Mr. Bryce some time ago.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not yet in a position to name a date for the introduction of the Bill on the subject of university education in Ireland.

Lord Kilmorey's County Down Estate

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what fixed price or percentage under the provisions of Section 23 (11) of the Land Act of 1903 has been arranged to be paid for negotiating the sale of Lord Kilmorey's estate, county Down.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have not yet fixed a negotiation fee in this case.

Irish Government Bill.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can name a date when he intends to introduce the Bill for the better government of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I cannot yet name a date, but I hope it will be an early one.

Draperstown Sewerage.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the state of the main sewer in High Street, Draperstown, county Derry; whether he is aware that this sewer has been blocked for a number of years, that the sewage of the houses adjoining can find no outlets, and as a consequence the public health is seriously menaced; if he is aware that the local board of guardians last September tore up the road to ascertain what was wrong, but left it with five or six feet deep of sewage rising near the surface, and protected round with wooden bars; and if, in the interests of the public health, he will cause inquiries to be made into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have ascertained from the Magherafelt Rural District Council that an obstruction exists in the main sewer at the back of the houses in New Row, Draperstown. A question has arisen as to whether the work of removing the obstruction should be carried out by the Council or the Drapers' Company, and this question was considered at a conference between a committee of the council and a committee of the Drapers' Company on the 6th instant. The result of the conference was to be considered at a meeting of the rural district council to-day.

Battery Sergeant-Majors and Quartermaster-Sergeants.

MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state how many battery sergeant-majors and battery quartermaster-sergeants will be affected by the Army Order, issued on the 11th March, which provides that continuance in the Service beyond twenty-one years of non-commissioned officers on the Home Establishment is to cease for the present.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Nine battery sergeant-majors and nine battery quartermaster-sergeants will be affected by the Army Order in question.

Limerick Barracks.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can make any report on the condition of the barracks, and particularly of the officers' quarters, at Limerick; whether he is aware that, when the 2nd Royal Munster Fusiliers arrived at Limerick a few weeks ago to occupy quarters vacated some six months previously by the 3rd Northumberland Fusiliers, they found them badly in need of repairs, littered with papers left behind by the latter regiment, showing that no proper cleansing of the barracks had taken place; whether in the officers' quarters the wall paper is peeling off the walls; if he will arrange to have the barracks generally put into a proper state of repair; and will he at the same time prevent any charges being made to the officers for that portion of the repairs carried out in the officers' quarters.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A report has been called for.

Cost of the Army.

MR. BRODIE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the average cost per man to the nation under the present system of the Infantry of the Line, Foot Guards, Cavalry, Household Cavalry, Horse Artillery, Field Artillery, Garrison Artillery, Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, taking each of the above arms separately, but including all ranks in each case; and what will be the corresponding figures, as far as it is possible to give them, under his new scheme.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*) For the purposes of this calculation the Regular peace establishments, exclusive of India, the normal numbers of the Army Reserve, and, for the new scheme, the Special Contingent and Special ervice section of the Territorial Army have been included. The average cost per head, all ranks, under the two systems is as follows:—

	Present System.	New System.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Infantry of the Line - - - - -	53 16 0	44 19 4
Foot Guards - - - - - -	46 16 6	46 16 6
Cavalry of the Line - - - - -	78 0 6	72 0 0
Household Cavalry - - - - -	110 2 0	110 2 0
Horse and Field Artillery - - - -	74 7 4	45 12 0
Garrison Artillery - - - - -	71 12 0	67 12 6
Militia - - - - - - -	21 9 3	—
Yeomanry - - - - - - -	19 17 0	—
Volunteers - - - - - - -	6 6 3	—
Territorial Army (all Arms)- - - -	—	9 4 0

Sergeant-Major Henson, R.H.A.

Captain FABER: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that in the Army list for January, 1907, R. Henson is shown amongst the warrant officers of the Royal Horse Artillery, and in that of March amongst those in the Royal Field Artillery, the transfer of this man has been caused by misconduct; and if so, whether, seeing that his transfer imposes a disadvantage upon his juniors in the Royal Field Artillery by stopping promotion amongst them, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Sergeant-major Henson was sergeant-major instructor at the riding establishment at Woolwich, and was reported by the commanding officer to be in some respects unequal to the important duties of his position. There was no vacancy in the Royal Horse Artillery in which he could be absorbed; he was consequently transferred to the Royal Field Artillery, This transfer in no way reflects on this warrant officer's character.

Superannuation.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the authorised scales of superannuation, retired pay, or pension of officials and officers serving His Majesty in the Civil, Naval, and Military Departments and Forces of the Crown are based on the *status* or rank last held by the official or officer as well as on the amount of salary then paid to him; and whether, as a general rule, each grade receives a higher rate of pension than the grade below.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The rules for calculating retired pay and pension cannot be shortly stated. They will be found, as regards the Navy, in the King's Regulations; as regards the Army, in the Royal Warrant on pay and non-effective pay; as regards Civil Service, in the Superannuation Acts of 1834 and 1859.

Colonial Conference.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Prime Minister what Members of His Majesty's Government will be present at the Colonial Conference.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I cannot conveniently give a list, but, as already explained and in accordance with the practice on previous occasions, Ministers will attend the Conference when there is business affecting their Departments.

Small Holdings Bill.

Mr. BRODIE: To ask the Prime Minister whether he can state the date or approximately the date on which the Small Holdings Bill promised in the King's Speech for England and Wales will be introduced.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) No, Sir. I cannot give my hon. friend the information for which he asks at present.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Gibraltar Dockyard.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what buildings have been omitted from the original scheme of the Gibraltar dockyard extension.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee): The buildings omitted are residences for principal and superior officers of the dockyard.

Greenwich Generating Station.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a formal reply on the subject of the generating station at Greenwich has yet been received from the London County Council, in compliance with the request made to them last month.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Admiralty wrote to the Council on the 16th March, asking if they were in a position to give a definite reply. At present only a formal acknowledgment has been received, but further steps are being taken to hasten the Council's reply.

Sir John Fisher's Pay.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in view of the Order in Council of 22nd February, 1870, providing that Admirals of the Fleet are to receive on retirement the half-pay of their rank, whether Sir John Fisher will receive on retirement the half-pay of an Admiral of the Fleet, or £1,222 15s. per annum, or the exceptional rate of half-pay of £2,000 per annum granted him under a secret Order in Council in 1906.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Under the authority of Order in Council of the 8th January, 1906, Sir John Fisher will receive retired pay at the rate of £2,000 a year.

Sea Lords' Salaries.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the total increase of salaries under all Votes for the four Sea Lords in this year's Navy Estimates over the amount paid in 1903–4; and why in the case of one Sea Lord the increase is made by an increase of half-pay mentioned in an appendix to the Navy Estimates, while in the case of the others it appears directly on Vote 12 for the Admiralty.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The total increase of emoluments under all Votes for the four Sea Lords in the Estimates of 1907–8 as compared with those for 1903–4 is £2,075 2s. 6d. The increase in the case of the First Sea Lord is partly due to the automatic increase of half-pay on his promotion to Admiral of the Fleet, and partly to the award of a special rate of half-pay in recognition of his distinguished services. It does not increase the emoluments of the post of First Sea Lord, and is not therefore provided for in Vote 12.

Engineer Officers' Shore Appointments.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many executive and engineer officers respectively are holding shore appointments, having served for more than five consecutive years in shore appointments; and whether these cases contravene the spirit of the Order in Council of 8th December, 1903, which was introduced to prevent the danger incurred in subsequently employing such officers in positions of responsibility afloat.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The numbers are three executive and eleven engineer officers. It is not likely that the majority of these officers will be required to go to sea again, and, in any case, the Order in Council, which does not apply to engineer officers, allows the Admiralty discretionary power in special cases.

H.M.S. "Blake" and "Blenheim."

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the "Blake" and "Blenheim" are being converted into mother-ships for destroyers, with only four six-inch guns left in each ship; and, if so, why they still appear in the Navy List as first-class cruisers.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The conversion named is not yet completed, and in the case of one vessel not yet commenced. The revision of classification will duly be considered.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Will the right hon. Gentleman take into consideration the advisability of reconsidering the system of classification adopted under what is called the Dilke Return so as to bring it more in accordance with the actual facts?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Yes, Sir.

Territorial Force's Allowances.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what sum proportionate to the £75 to be allotted to each company of the territorial forces for contingencies and administration will be paid to the other units of the territorial force.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): Estimates for contingencies and administration of other units were as follows:—Cavalry Squadron, £150; Horse Artillery battery, £75; Army Service Corps Column, £150; Cavalry Field Ambulance, £75; Field Artillery Brigade, £600; Howitzer Brigade, £450; Heavy Battery, £150; Field Company, R.E., £150. It must be remembered that these figures are only approximate estimates based upon the present average expenditure of Volunteer Corps.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War upon whom will rest the responsibility of settling which half of the non-commissioned officers will not be entitled to receive separation allowances under the Territorial Forces scheme.

Mr. HALDANE: It was assumed, as a rough estimate, that about 50 per cent. of non-commissioned officers below the rank of serjeant would be married, and would consequently be eligible for separation allowance. These figures were calculated for the purpose of giving an approximate estimate of the total cost of the territorial Forces. Regulations will be subsequently issued regarding the issue of separation allowances under the Territorial Forces scheme.

Brigade Majors of Volunteers.

Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the reports from the General Officers Commanding, to which he referred on 11th December, 1906,† in reply to a Question on the subject of the expenses falling on the brigade majors of Volunteer brigades, have been received; and whether he can now see his way to grant adequate allowances to these officers in view of their increased duties and expenses.

Mr. HALDANE: The reports have been received, and the whole question is being carefully considered.

Mr. CARLILE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how long the Question will be under consideration?

Mr. HALDANE: I cannot.

Royal Arsenal, Woolwich.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Stepney Division of Tower Hamlets, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any of the discharge notices recently issued in the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, are due to the cancelling or suspending of work on orders already placed; and whether the reserve of vehicles for the Field Artillery is sufficient to place that arm upon a war footing at the present time.

Mr. HALDANE: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. As regards the last part of the Question, the reserve of vehicles for the Field Artillery will be sufficient to place that arm upon a war footing when the orders have been completed.

Chicago Meat-Packing Establishments.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will publish the Report by Lieutenant-Colonel Hobbes on the conditions which he found to obtain in the packing establishments of Chicago.

Mr. HALDANE: As I have explained to the House on a previous occasion, it is not intended to publish this Report.

China and Indian Opium.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to lay upon the Table the proposals of the Government of China regarding the importation into that country of Indian opium, and the Report of the Government of India thereon.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs): The matter is under my consideration, and I do not think that it would be for the public interest to lay any of the Papers on the Table at this stage.

Indian Budget.

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India when the Indian Budget is likely to be taken.

Mr. MORLEY: I hope I may be allowed to refer the hon. Member to the Answer that I gave him on the 18th March,‡ to which I am unable to add anything at present.

Church of Scotland Chaplains in India.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Act of 3 and 4 Will. 4, c. 85, s. 102, stipulates that at each of the Presidencies two of the chaplains shall always be ministers of the Church of Scotland; whether there are eight Church of Scotland chaplains in Bengal, four in Bombay, and four in Madras; whether, seeing that the same section of the said Act gives to the Governor General the right to grant to any sect, persuasion, or community of Christians, not being of the United Church of England and Ireland, or of the Church of Scotland, such sums of money as may be expedient for the purpose of instruction or for the maintenance of places of worship, he can see his way to consider nominations from ministers and licentiates of Presbyterian churches, other than the Established Church of Scotland, for the chaplaincies other than the two reserved in each Presidency for ministers of the Church of Scotland.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxvii., 120.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 642.

MR. MORLEY: I am aware of the facts stated in the first two paragraphs of the Question. As to the third paragraph, the action at present taken under the provision of the law referred to in it is limited to the payment of the expenses of ministrations to troops by ministers belonging to denominations other than the two established churches. The clergy so subsidised are not on the Government establishment. I am advised that it is doubtful whether the terms of the statute admit of the appointment to the establishment of ministers not belonging to either of those two churches.

MR. GULLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that since the passage of the Act of 3 and 4 Will. 4 there has been a disruption in the Church of Scotland; that according to the law of the Established Church of Scotland the minister of any Presbyterian church can be admitted as a minister of the Established Church; that, on 27th March 1907, the Presbytery of Edinburgh, which has jurisdiction over the Presbyterian chaplains in India, refused, by 36 votes to 4, to adopt an overture limiting that law; that, on 1st April 1907, the Presbytery of Glasgow unanimously sustained a call from Townhead parish church to a minister of the United Free Church of Scotland; and whether, in view of these facts, he would be prepared to consider nominations for Presbyterian chaplaincies in India from ministers and licentiates of Presbyterian churches other than the Established Church of Scotland, without requiring them previously to join that Church.

MR. MORLEY: I have no information as to the recent occurrences referred to in the hon. Member's Question; but as regards the inquiry in the last paragraph, I have nothing to add to my Answer just given to his previous Question.

Bacteriological Institute in Mauritius.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state when it was decided to create a bacteriological institute in Mauritius; can he state the actual date on which the director was appointed; and whether the director is now resident in Mauritius, or is he in Europe.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The establishment of such an institute was first approved in 1904, and the agreement with Dr. Lafont, who has been appointed director, was signed on 28th September last. He is at present in Europe.

Mauritius Legislative Council.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a feeling exists amongst the majority of the inhabitants of Mauritius for an increase in the number of elected members sitting in the Legislative Council; has any communication on this subject been submitted to the Colonial Office during the last three years; and, if so, will the complete correspondence be issued as a Parliamentary Paper.

MR. CHURCHILL: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The only representation on the subject which has been received during the last three years is one from inhabitants of the district of Flaines Wilhems asking for an additional member for the district, which the Governor was unable to endorse. The Secretary of State does not propose to lay Papers.

Trinidad Local Customs Tariff.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is yet in a position to give the names of the Commission appointed by the Trinidad Government to revise the local customs tariff; whether a representative of the working class has been appointed a member of the Commission; whether evidence from the working class will be called; and whether the proceedings of the said Commission will be made public.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Committee to which the hon. Member refers consisted of the Collector of Customs of Trinidad, the Receiver General, two members of the Legislative Council, three merchants, and two agriculturists. No member of the wage-earning class was appointed on the Committee. Evidence from that class was received, and the Governor reports that their views are fully dealt with in the Committee's Report. It is not proposed that the proceedings of the Committee should be made public, but its Report will be published in due course.

Imprisonment of British Subjects in East Africa—Cases of Captain Grogan and Mr. Bowker.

MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, if his attention has been drawn to the recent disturbances in British East Africa, which led to the imprisonment of Captain Grogan and Mr. Bowker, at Nairobi; whether he can say if the two gentlemen were placed in the same prison as the natives; and whether he can give any information as to the particular crime for which they were convicted.

MR. CARLILE: At the same time may I ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether Captain Grogan, Messrs. Bowker, Gray, and others have been committed to prison at Nairobi, British East Africa, for chastising natives alleged to have insulted white women; and, if so, whether these Englishmen are now incarcerated in a common prison at Nairobi with native felons; and whether the Colonial Secretary will give the necessary instructions for their immediate release.

MR. CHURCHILL: With regard to the second part of both Questions I do not know whether these men are confined at Nairobi or Mombasa. In neither case is there a special prison for Europeans, but, although Europeans and natives are imprisoned in the same building, they are, of course, kept in different parts of it. Provision has been made in this year's Estimates for the construction of a prison for Europeans at Nairobi. With regard to the remaining part of the Questions, I think it will be convenient if I read the written Answer which I gave yesterday to the hon. Member for Kingston. "According to the Secretary of State's present information, these men were charged with holding an unlawful meeting and resisting the police. The officer administering the Government reports that the insult was apparently not of a serious nature, and at most did not amount to more than rudeness and disobedience. He further reports that after collecting upwards of 100 Europeans, of whom many were armed, Captain Grogan and the persons acting with him flogged the three natives concerned in a most brutal manner, in front of the Courthouse at Nairobi, in spite of the attempted intervention of the magistrate and a police officer. The natives were not handed over to the police. As at present informed, the Secretary of State sees no reason for revising the sentence of the Magistrate's Court upon Captain Grogan, and he proposes to defer the question of laying Papers on the Table of the House until he has received full details by mail."

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) asked how it was that, if these Englishmen were guilty of the brutal assault the hon. Gentleman described, they were charged not with the assault, but with the somewhat technical offence of unlawful assembly; and whether it was the fact that the natives said to have been assaulted by Captain Grogan applied to Captain Grogan the same evening to be reinstated in his service.

MR. CHURCHILL said he had given the House the information which the Secretary of State had received officially from the officer of the Government of the East African Protectorate.

*MR. CAVE: The right hon. Gentleman has promised to lay Papers when the mail arrives. Will not the sentences have been practically served by that time? Will the hon. Gentleman lay the telegram he has received?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have given the House practically the substance of the operative telegram.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) asked whether the hon. Gentleman, in view of the state of the prison accommodation at Mombasa and Nairobi, would take steps to see that these men were not treated in the same way in prison as an Englishman was treated last year.

MR. CHURCHILL: Great improvements have been made in the accommodation of the gaols at Nairobi and Mombasa, and further improvements are in contemplation. No doubt everything will be done to make the conditions of the imprisonment of Europeans conditions which are not detrimental to their health and not derogatory to the proper standards of humanity. Of course the country is still in a very primitive condition of development, and persons who misconduct themselves in countries in that condition of development are liable to suffer.

MR. CARLILE asked whether the hon. Gentleman was aware that the prison at Nairobi consisted of a single courtyard, with buildings round it occupied in common by whites and blacks, and that in such a prison in the tropics it was impossible for the prisoners to remain within the buildings, and therefore whites and blacks were in joint occupation.

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): Are the warders who look after European prisoners, natives or Europeans?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

*MR. CAVE asked whether the hon. Gentleman had been informed that Captain Grogan's health was such that imprisonment of the character described might have very serious results.

MR. CHURCHILL: Information has been brought to my notice personally, and also to that of the Secretary of State to that effect. I have no means of testing that information, but a telegram has been sent to the officer administering the Government of the East African Protectorate to take careful note of the fact and investigate it, in order that no serious detriment may occur.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.),

MR. CHURCHILL added that the whole question of imprisonment or release was in the discretion of the officer administering the Government, whom the Government were supporting in the action he had taken.

Judges in British East Africa.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the previous judicial experience, and what were the professional qualifications of the judges and magistrates now doing duty in British East Africa.

I beg further to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many officials in the administration of British East Africa have had South African or other African or Colonial experience.

MR. CHURCHILL: I would refer the hon. Member to the list of officials given at page 48 to 73m of the "Handbook for East Africa, Uganda, and Zanzibar, 1907," which furnishes particulars regarding their Colonial experience. I am having a copy of the book in question sent to the hon. Member.

White Settlers in British East Africa.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any steps are being taken to promote white settlements on the upland districts of British East Africa; and whether it is the intention of the Administration to bring Indian settlers to these districts, which are suitable for European colonisation.

MR. CHURCHILL: No special steps are being taken to induce persons to leave this country in order to settle in the East Africa Protectorate; but the Government is incurring considerable expenditure on the Survey, Veterinary and Agricultural Departments, and in other ways, in order to assist those who have actually settled there. I am not by any means in a position to say that British Indian subjects will be altogether excluded from these districts.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Is there any probability of the Report referred to in the Question being speedily brought before the House?

MR. CHURCHILL: I did not refer to a Report. I said the Government were incurring considerable expenditure in developing these particular Departments.

Administration of British East Africa.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when a legislative council is to be given to British East Africa; whether a white police are to be organised, and of what kind; and what precautions are being taken meanwhile to protect the lives and property of Europeans.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State cannot at present name a date for the establishment of the proposed legislative council. A small force of white police is being recruited locally, but rather in order to obviate the necessity for European offenders being arrested by the native police than with a view of protecting the lives and property of Europeans which are not believed to be in any danger, sufficient protection being afforded by the native police and the King's African Rifles.

New Hebrides Convention.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if a Commission to settle administrative details in connection with the New Hebrides Convention has been appointed; if so, can he state the place and date of meeting of the said Commission; and can he give any further information to the House on the subject.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): A small Anglo-French Committee is being appointed to settle the salaries and other conditions of service of the officials of the Joint Court established by the New Hebrides Convention. This Committee will probably meet in London, but the date of meeting has not yet been definitely fixed.

MR. ALDEN asked if he was to understand that the terms of the Commission did not extend outside, merely affecting salaries.

SIR EDWARD GREY said that was so.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Is there no intention to extend the scope of this Commission, in view of the promises made by the right hon. Gentleman that questions relating to the employment of natives outside the New Hebrides, and the regulations relating to them, should be submitted to a Commission of this sort?

SIR EDWARD GREY: This Committee is appointed for this special purpose. If larger questions are to be raised they will have to be considered with reference to something else.

New Hebrides Conference.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, who will represent this Country at the conference with the French Government on the New Hebrides Convention; and if representatives of Australia and New Zealand may be allowed to take official part in the proceedings.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The representative of His Majesty's Government on the Anglo-French Committee has not yet been selected. The Governments of Australia and New Zealand will probably appoint their own representatives on the Committee.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when and where the Conference with the French Government to settle the by-laws of the New Hebrides Convention will meet.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must refer the hon. Member to the reply returned to-day to the hon. Member for Tottenham.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: Have the Government any intention of altering the conditions of the Convention?

Sir EDWARD GREY: That matter cannot arise in connection with this Conference.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Will the Australasian Government be invited to send delegates?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have said they will probably appoint their own representatives.

Congo Free State Administration.

Mr. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is aware that reports of great cruelty and oppression in the Congo Free State have been received from Mr. Jeffrey, of Ikan, and Mr. Ernest Cartwright, of Baronga; whether he can give the House any official information on these reports; and what action, if any, he proposes to take.

Sir EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Consul at Boma has sent home a letter received by him from Mr. Cartwright in regard to the incidents alluded to. They have already been brought to the knowledge of the Judge Substitute, and it would not appear that there is at this stage, at any rate, any further action to be taken as regards this particular case.

Sweden and Norway.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any progress has yet been made in the negotiations between this country and other Powers with a view to the substitution of a new treaty for that of 1855 with reference to Sweden and Norway.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I can only refer the hon. Member to my reply of 26th February on this subject,[†] to which, at present, I have nothing to add. It would in any case be unusual to make statements about negotiations which concern several other Powers while they are incomplete.

Mr. ASHLEY: Can the right hon. Baronet say when the negotiations are likely to be finished?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I can say nothing about that.

Suppression of the Opium Traffic—Conference.

Mr. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government has consented to be represented at the Conference called by the United States Government to consider the question of the suppression of the opium traffic; whether any other Powers have given their adherence to this proposal; and whether the House can be furnished with the terms of reference and the programme of the Conference.

Sir EDWARD GREY: As regards the first part of the Question, the United States Government have been informed that His Majesty's Government are willing, on certain conditions, stated in my reply of 20th March to the hon. Member for Rushcliffe,[‡] to take part in a joint international Conference or Commission of investigation. The replies of the other Powers consulted have not yet been communicated to His Majesty's Government, nor have any terms of reference or programme for the Conference or Commission yet been submitted.

Egyptian Secret Service Fund.

Mr. J. M. ROBERSTON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state the amounts of money annually granted to Lord Cromer and Sir Reginald Wingate for secret service purposes in Egypt and the Soudan during the past five years.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Details of the distribution of secret service funds are never published. It clearly could not be done without destroying the use of the fund.

Egyptian Concessions Board.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Egyptian Government has appointed a Concessions Board, consisting of Mr. Mitchell Innes, Chitty Bey, and Rocca Serra; if so, will he say by whom they were nominated, for how long, how many sittings have they held, how many and what concessions have been submitted to and granted by them, and why no native sits on the board.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clxix., 1428.

[‡] See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 850.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the subject, which falls within the competence of the Egyptian Government.

Egyptian Landholders—Penalties for Infraction of Rules.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the penalties inflicted on landowners in Egypt for infractions of rules take the form of withdrawal of irrigation water supply for a given number of days; whether he can state the number of cases in which such penalties were inflicted during the past year; and whether, seeing that such penalties are inexpedient, as having the effect of seriously checking agricultural production, he will instruct the British Agent at Cairo to advise the substitution of fines and other penalties of a less economically injurious character.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on this subject; I do not consider it advisable to instruct the British Agent to interfere more than is necessary in matters of administrative detail.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us some idea of the lines of instruction beyond which he does not consider it necessary to go?

SIR EDWARD GREY: It would be exceedingly difficult to lay down a definition, but our general policy is to interfere as little as possible when you have good men in charge.

Newspapers in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Agency at Cairo grants any subvention to a Syrian journal entitled *Al Mokattam*, published in Arabic, a Coptic journal entitled *Al Wartan*, and a French journal entitled *Les Progres*, owned by a Greek, or any of them; and, if so, what amount is annually paid to each.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot answer this Question. It is one on which, if I had any information, I should have to decline to give it.

British Consular Service in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that in the British Consular Service in China and Japan promotion depends largely upon proficiency in the native language; whether three years study is prescribed, with at least three examinations; and whether he will take steps to secure that in Egypt, where the British civil servants are so largely engaged in administrative duties, a similar standard of proficiency in the native language shall be established for them.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Promotion in the British Consular Service in China and Japan no doubt depends greatly on proficiency in the native language. I have no reason to believe that this is not also the case in the Egyptian Civil Service, but Englishmen in the service of the Khedive are subject to regulations laid down by the Egyptian Government, and not by that of His Majesty. It is, however, the case that the native language is one of the qualifications for entry into the Egyptian Service.

Egyptian Milk Supply.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there are in Egypt any penal or other regulations intended to insure a pure milk supply for human consumption or to prevent the adulteration of alimentary substances and liquids; and, if so, what was the number of prosecutions, convictions, and repeated convictions, and the penalties or other, and what, punishment imposed or inflicted in respect of breach of such regulations during the last five years.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the subject; but I would point out that a serious obstacle to effective regulations of the nature described exists in the *régime* of the Capitulations.

Cattle Disease in Egypt.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that, according to the Report for 1905 of the Egyptian Government inspector, Monsieur Piot Bey, the precautions taken against the importation of diseased cattle into Upper and Lower Egypt are insufficient; and whether proper measures of prevention have been taken or are in contemplation.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not seen the Report in question; the only information I have recently received on the subject of cattle plague in Egypt is contained in Section 83 of Lord Cromer's Report for 1906.

Prison Warders' Grievances.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has recently received a number of petitions from the warders and assistant warders of His Majesty's prisons, both metropolitan and provincial; whether these petitions show a state of unrest and dissatisfaction both as to wages and conditions of service on the part of prison officers; and whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a small Committee to inquire into these alleged grievances, or whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): Petitions were received last year from all local prisons asking for an improvement in the scale of pay. After a careful examination of the matter I was able, with the consent of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and on the advice of the Prison Commissioners, to grant considerable improvements by increasing the maximum salary of the different warder ranks, by giving larger annual increments of pay to the warders and principal warders, and by raising the lodging allowance at provincial prisons where proof was forthcoming that the authorised rate, owing to the prevalence of high rents in certain places, entailed pecuniary loss on officers for whom it was not possible to provide quarters. There was nothing in the petitions to justify their being described as showing a state of unrest and dissatisfaction, and I see no occasion for any further inquiry. A full account of the increases in pay, etc., was given in my printed Answer to a Question put by my hon. friend the Member for Rochester on 15th November last. †

The Prerogative of Mercy.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any settled principles govern the exercise of the prerogative of mercy in cases involving the capital sentence; and, if not, whether he will consider the desirability of taking steps to establish such principles.

MR. GLADSTONE: It would be neither desirable nor possible to lay down hard and fast rules as to the exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy. Numerous considerations—the motive, the degree of premeditation or deliberation, the amount of provocation, the state of mind of the prisoner, his physical condition, his character and antecedents, the recommendation or absence of recommendation from the jury, and many others—have to be taken into account in every case; and the decision depends on full review of a complex combination of circumstances, and often on the careful balancing of conflicting considerations. As Sir William Harcourt said in this House, "The exercise of the prerogative of mercy does not depend on principles of strict law or justice, still less does it depend on sentiment in any way. It is a question of policy and judgment in each case, and in my opinion a capital execution which in its circumstances creates horror and compassion for the culprit rather than a sense of indignation at his crime is a great evil." There are, it is true, important principles which I and my advisers have constantly to bear in mind; but an attempt to reduce these principles to formulæ and to exclude all considerations which are incapable of being formulated in precise terms would not, I believe, aid any Home Secretary in the consideration of the difficult questions which he has to decide.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to suspend capital punishment until a Court of Criminal Appeal has been established.

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxv., 84.

Deportation of British Subjects.

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many British subjects have been sentenced to deportation under the Aliens Act; whether any were actually deported; and what steps, if any, were taken by the police authorities to ascertain the prisoner's place of birth.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The Aliens Act does not provide for the expulsion from the United Kingdom of British subjects and none have been expelled. In four cases evidence has been forthcoming, after expulsion was recommended by the Court, that the prisoner was a British subject, and in these cases I have, of course, refrained from making expulsion orders. The onus of establishing his British nationality rests with the prisoner.

Inspection of Underground Bakehouses.

Mr. WILKIE (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the officers of the Factory Department have taken any samples of the air in underground bakehouses after long spells of work in these places; and whether assistant inspectors are forbidden to enter bakehouses where machinery is used.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Air samples are taken at the discretion of the inspectors, and no special instructions have been given as regards underground bakehouses. I am unable to say without further inquiry to what extent samples of air in these bakehouses have been taken by the inspectors, but I may perhaps remind the hon. Member that special provision with regard to the ventilation of underground bakehouses is made by the Factory Act, Section 101 of which prohibits the use of any underground bakehouse unless it has been certified by the district council to be suitable for the purpose as regards construction, light, ventilation, and in all other respects. As regards the last part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by me, on the 18th February, † with regard to the new scheme of duties for factory inspectors' assistants in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Leicester.

Electric Tramcar Fatalities.

Mr. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that seven accidents, due to brake failures and resulting in loss of lives, have occurred on corporation and other electric tramways within the last eighteen months; and whether, in view of the development of electric traction, he will appoint a Committee to inquire into the best system of brake-power which should be adopted, with a view to its compulsory adoption, in the same manner as on railways, in order to prevent such recurrences.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnavon Boroughs): I am aware that there have been several fatal accidents in the period mentioned due to tramcars running away or leaving the rails, and that in some cases the brake mechanism was in fault. The whole question of tramway braking appliances is at present being investigated by Committees appointed by the Tramways and Light Railways Association and the Municipal Tramways Association respectively, and the Board of Trade have expressed their willingness to assist in a joint inquiry at a later stage.

Limited Liability Companies.

Mr. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what was the number of limited liability companies registered in the year 1906, and the amount of their nominal share capital.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The number of limited liability companies registered in the year 1906 in the United Kingdom was 4,840 and the amount of their nominal share capital was £136,738,249.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman gave the amount actually invested ?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE asked for notice of the Question.

Newton Heath Railway Accident.

Mr. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to an accident at Newton Heath, Manchester, on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway, on 25th March, in which several passengers were injured; and, if so, whether an inquiry has been ordered; and whether such inquiry will include questions as to how long the fireman had been in the service of the company, and how many days he had been employed on passengers or other trains.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxix., 551.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: This accident was duly reported by the railway company and an inquiry into the circumstances attending it will be held by an inspecting officers of railways.

Hamburg Dock Strike.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of labourers who have left this country for Hamburg during the past four weeks, and the number who have returned to this country during the same period.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have been unable to obtain this information.

MR. FELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to get it shortly?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not think it can be obtained at all. We have no means of ascertaining it.

MR. FELL: But has not the Board of Trade particulars of those who leave the country?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: We have statistics, but nothing to show why the labourers have gone over there.

Scales of Discarded War Stores in London.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, according to the report of the medical officer of health for the City of London, tinned foods, consisting of left-over war stores from South Africa, are being continually put upon the market at low prices and sold to the poor of East and South London; that some of it has been dealt with as trade refuse by one of the borough councils; and whether, in view of these facts, he will cause special inquiry to be made with regard to the distribution and sale of these doubtful stores.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I understand that the medical officer of health for the City has made a report on this subject, and I have asked for a copy of it. I believe, however, that the facts are generally as stated in the Question. I have for some months past endeavoured to ascertain all the available facts as to the importation and distribution of the foods referred to, and as far as practicable to prevent their reaching the public when they have been unsound or dangerous. As I have, however, stated on previous occasions further legislation of the kind contemplated by the Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill now before the House is necessary to enable a matter of this kind to be dealt with effectively.

Erith Relief Works.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Board has reconsidered its decision with regard to the scheme for relief works submitted by the Erith Distress Committee, the carrying out of which the urban council expressed its willingness to support; and can he now state whether arrangements have been made to grant assistance.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received from the distress committee a letter, dated 5th April, asking me to reconsider my decision in this matter. It did not appear to me that this letter showed any sufficient ground for an alteration in the decision referred to; but, even if it had, it was impossible for me to comply with the request for a payment out of the grant, as no payment could be made out of it after 31st March, when the financial year ended for the service of which it was voted.

Glamorganshire Education Estimates.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the estimates made by the Glamorganshire County Council for the year ending 31st March, 1908, the amount estimated to be received in respect of Government grants for voluntary schools is £19,000, and the amount estimated to be spent in the maintenance of the same schools is also £19,000; and whether, seeing that no part of the salary of teachers in voluntary schools is estimated to fall upon the rates in that county, he will except the voluntary schools in it from the provisions of the Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I do not consider that the financial estimates of the Glamorganshire County Council, framed before the Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill is passed, afford any ground for anticipating by an amendment the state of affairs which will exist when that Bill becomes law. I should in any case be unable to adopt a course the effect of which would be to maintain the existing statutory obligation upon the local education authority to defray the cost of giving special religious instruction in voluntary schools.

* LORD R. CECIL: Will the effect of the Bill be to remove the statutory obligation to defray the cost of religious instruction?

MR. McKENNA: The effect will be to throw on the managers the cost of giving special religious instruction.

Royston Schoolmaster.

*MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that Mr. O. Milnes was appointed as headmaster of the Royston National school by the casting vote of the chairman of the managers, the Reverend R. J. Thorpe; that the local education authority refused to consent to the appointment solely on educational grounds; that of the sixty-two applications there were at least five among the applicants who were more suitable than Mr. Milnes for that particular post; that the Sharlston elementary school is not comparable in point of average attendance and responsibility to the Royston National school; and whether, seeing that it is an all-sufficient reason for a local education authority to withhold their consent to an appointment on educational grounds, His Majesty's inspector, Mr. Marvin, did not exceed his duty in furthering the interests of one teacher to the disadvantage of other teachers in the West Riding who are better qualified on educational grounds.

MR. McKENNA: I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave yesterday† except that I am unable to agree with my hon. friend that His Majesty's inspector exceeded his duty in stating his opinion, when asked, that Mr. Milnes was not educationally unfit for the position of head master of the Royston school.

His Majesty's School Inspectors.

*MR. CLOUGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to lay down a general rule that His Majesty's inspectors should take up an impartial attitude between different members of the teaching profession; and in cases of dispute between denominational boards of managers and the local education authority?

MR. McKENNA: Yes, Sir.

Monmouthshire Education Committee.

LORD R. CECIL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that the Monmouthshire Education Committee recently passed a resolution that the salaries of teachers who had completed their apprenticeship should be raised to £25, and subsequently stated that the resolution applied only to teachers in council schools, he proposes to take any action to remedy this treatment of teachers in voluntary schools.

MR. McKENNA: The settlement of the salaries of teachers rests with the local education authority and so long as the local education authority fulfil their statutory duty to maintain and keep efficient the public elementary schools in their area, I see no reason to interfere.

Butter Adulteration.

*MR. NUTTALL (Lancashire, Stretford): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been drawn to the conviction of certain butter merchants at Bath on the 20th March, who were fined £50 and costs for selling butter alleged to contain 16·4 per cent. of water, whilst the analysis made at the Government laboratory showed only 15·82 per cent. of water, or 0·18 per cent. less than the presumptive limit of the Board of Agriculture; whether he is aware that the Government analyst stated that the difference between his own percentages and those of the prosecution might be largely accounted for, if not entirely, by the process of evaporation; and whether, seeing that the Government analyst corroborated the analysis of the prosecution by a statement founded on mere surmise, when his own analysis showed that the legal limit had not been exceeded, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

---

† See Col.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somerset, S.): The Answer to the first two parts of my hon. friend's Question is in the affirmative. With regard to the third part, I may say that notice of appeal against the decision of the magistrates has been given, but that in any case the Board have no authority to interfere.

Greenock Prison Governorship.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the store warder in Dundee prison has recently been promoted to be governor of Greenock prison; if so, will he say whether due consideration was given to the qualifications of other warders of equal merit and longer service; and on what grounds the Dundee warder was singled out for exceptional promotion over the heads of other meritorious warders senior to him in the service.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The promotion as stated by my hon. friend has been made. After due consideration had been given to the qualifications of other warders, both as to merit and length of service, this officer was selected.

MR. WATT: Was this appointment made on the initiative of the Prisons Board or on that of the right hon. Gentleman?

MR. SINCLAIR: It was made on my responsibility after consultation with the Prisons Board.

Training of Scottish Teachers.

MR. GULLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, before the programme of work for senior students drawn up by the provincial committees for the training of teachers is put in operation, he, as Vice-President of the Scottish Education Department, will satisfy himself that, while due provision is made for professional studies, nothing is done to interfere with the progress of the students in their general education.

MR. SINCLAIR: The proposals of the provincial committees for a programme of work for their senior students require the approval of the Department under Article 18 of the Regulations for the Preliminary Education and Training of Teachers, and, as the Minister responsible for the decisions of the Department, I will see that the proposals sanctioned make due provision for the general education of the students as distinct from their professional training.

River Annan Fishery.

MR. GULLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the case tried in Dumfries Sheriff Court on 20th March, when Thomas Murray, of Moffat, was fined 10s., with 30s. of expenses, for fishing for salmon in the River Annan, though there was abundant evidence that the streams around Moffat had been regularly fished both for salmon and trout for many years without permission and without challenge; and whether the Government will take into consideration the circumstances of all the rivers in the south of Scotland as well as in the case of the Tweed.

MR. SINCLAIR: My attention has not been drawn to this matter otherwise than by my hon. friend's Question. I am not in a position to express any opinion as to the evidence laid before the Court on which the decision was founded. The general question, as I have previously stated, is under consideration.

Driver Gourlay's Sentence.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the circumstances under which Driver

Gourlay was sentenced at Edinburgh, on 12th March, to five months imprisonment; and, in view of Gourlay's age and exceptionally good character, whether he can now remit the remaining portion of the sentence.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The most anxious consideration has been given to this matter, and after making full allowance for the exceptional circumstances of the case I did not feel myself justified in recommending a greater remission than two months. The Answer, therefore, to the Question is in the negative.

Irish University Education Bill.

Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is in a position to give an approximate date for the introduction of the proposed Bill dealing with University education in Ireland.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): I am not yet in a position to name an approximate date for the introduction of the proposed Bill dealing with University education in Ireland.

Cusack Estate Cottage Loan.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will state when the loan to Robert Armstrong to build a cottage on the lands of Mornin, on the Cusack estate, recently allotted to him, will be made.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have not yet acquired possession of the property in question, and until they do so they cannot issue the free grant which they propose to make for building purposes in the case of Robert Armstrong.

Cusack Estate Evicted Tenant.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that pressure is being brought upon the Estates Commissioners by Mr. George Henry Miller, a member of the Land Commission staff, to leave Mr. Alexander Frayne in possession of the holding on the Cusack estate which the Commissioners have decided to restore to Mr. Swifte, the evicted tenant; and, if so, will he request the Commissioners to adhere to their former ruling.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have made an offer to the Land Judge for the purchase of the estate in question, including the holding now occupied by Mr. Frayne. If the Commissioners should acquire this holding they propose to sell portion of it to Mr. Swifte, evicted tenant. The Commissioners inform me that there is no foundation for the suggestion that Mr. Miller has brought any pressure to bear on them in the matter.

"Grabbing" at Lanesborough.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in 1900 the village of Lanesborough was purchased under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Acts and all the householders, except Terence Farrell, became proprietors of their own homes; whether he is aware that this man's holding has now been grabbed by a sapper working in county Cavan, named Connor, whose action has created the utmost indignation in the locality; and whether he will instruct the Local Government Board to place at the disposal of the Longford district council the money originally advanced, but subsequently withdrawn, for the purchase of Farrell's holding, and thus prevent a breach of the peace in this district.

Mr. BIRRELL: In October 1901 the Local Government Board sanctioned a loan of £1,222 to the Longford Rural District Council in order to enable them to make loans for the purchase of certain houses under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act. This amount included provision for an advance to Terence Farrell of £84, being four-fifths of the value of his house, Farrell himself being liable for the balance of the purchase money. The loan was approved by the Treasury, but the district council borrowed only £1,100 of the amount, and it would seem from the Question that Farrell's application was withdrawn. The Local Government Board have no information that Farrell's holding has been acquired by Connor. It rests with the district council to determine whether an advance should be made for the purchase of Farrell's holding, as the Board's sanction of the full loan of £1,222 still holds good, assuming that the purchase can be legally proceeded with.

Irish Linen Damask.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tidvil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what action he has taken or contemplates to compel the manufacturers of damask to have the words "Irish hand-woven linen damask" woven into the fabric of all such goods produced in Ireland.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am not aware that the Board of Trade have any power to compel manufacturers of damask to mark their goods in the manner suggested.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: My suggestion is that they should secure such powers in continuation of existing powers which enable them to compel the name to be written in ink.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am not sure whether that point could be considered by the Committee on Trade which is now considering the Merchandise Marks Bill.

Mr. LIDDELL (Down, W.): Is it not a fact that damask manufacturers in Ireland are quite prepared to adopt the marking suggested in the Question, and that in some cases they have already done so, but that in many cases the firms they do business with object?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I should like notice of that Question.

Blocking Motions.

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of recent instances of Members successful in the ballot for private Members' Motions having had their right rendered abortive by Members introducing Bills on similar subjects, the Government will take steps during the discussion of the Procedure Rules to render such action impossible.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper:—

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): To ask the Prime Minister whether, in continuation of his Motion upon the Order Paper in reference to the Standing Orders of the House, he can see his way to propose a new Standing Order which shall protect an hon. Member who has secured priority by ballot from being deprived of his opportunity of bringing on a Motion in the House by the introduction of a Bill on a similar subject by some other hon. Member.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask the Prime Minister when the Government will introduce the Standing Order, indicated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to put a stop to the practice of setting down blocking Motions and blocking Bills.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Questions standing in the name of my hon. friend the Member for the Appleby Division and the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone at the same time. We shall be very glad if a remedy can be found for the present practice, which is open to serious objection. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the last day before the House adjourned for the Easter recess stated on behalf of the Government that we would consider the matter with the view to concerted action on the part of all sections of the House. This particular question does not come within the scope of the scheme of changes in the Rules of Procedure now under consideration, but it can be dealt with as soon as we have made sure that it can be freed from controversy, and that the acceptance of a proposal on the subject by the House would not involve any loss of time.

Lord R. CECIL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether any steps have been taken to see whether such an arrangement is possible?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Not during the Easter recess.

Lord R. CECIL: Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the fact that the Easter recess has come to an end for some days?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is sometimes a little margin allowed.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the unanimous declaration of this House, just before the Easter recess, that the practice referred to is hurtful to the usefulness of the House and an infringement of the rights of Members, does not, in the opinion of the Government, bind the action of Members.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I wish it did. But the Resolution certainly furnishes grounds for hope that such a desirable result may be attained.

Royal Bounty Fund.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that a grant of £75 was made in the year 1897 from the Royal Bounty and Special Service Fund to Mr. Thomas Hardman, formerly clerk of the Clerkenwell County Court, after twenty years service, during which he was allowed one year and three months leave of absence, he can see his way to make a similar grant in the case of Mr. Charles George Hunt, of Danesbury, Warwick Road, New Barnet, who served in the same capacity at the same court for nearly sixty years, during which period he was only allowed nine months leave of absence, and who is now in failing health and in impoverished circumstances.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Payments from the fund referred to are made solely at my discretion. The case of Mr. Hunt has been decided on its merits; and I must abide by the decision, at which I have without hesitation arrived, that it is not a proper case for a grant of Royal Bounty. I understand that Mr. Hardman's case was a peculiar one as his eyesight had failed from an exceptional strain incurred in the execution of his duties.

MR. CARLILE: Is there any continuity in the principle under which these grants are made? If so, on what ground was a grant refused in this case? Was not Mr. Hunt with his sixty years service as fully entitled to a grant as Mr. Hardman with twenty years service?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The grants are made purely as a matter of grace, and each case is dealt with on its own merits. I have no personal knowledge of or responsibility for the decision in Mr. Hardman's case, but in the case of Mr. Hunt I am satisfied there is no reason for a grant from this fund.

MR. CARLILE: Was not there greater merit arising from the fact that Mr. Hunt had sixty years service?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Perhaps I may be allowed to say I do not think there is anything less likely to be beneficial, than that my discretion in applying this fund should be made the subject of discussion on the floor of this House.

Scottish Privy Council on Education.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education in Scotland are responsible for their proceedings to this House; and when and where their proceedings are conducted.

SIR H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN: The Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education in Scotland are represented by the Secretary for Scotland who is Vice-President of that Committee and responsible to this House for Scottish Education. It would be contrary to precedent and practice to give particulars as to meetings of any Committee of the Privy Council.

MR. SMEATON: Can the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that the names of the Members present at the preparation of the minutes shall be attached to them.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We follow ancient practice in this matter.

*MR. MORTON: Has this Privy Council ever held a meeting?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have been, in more Governments than one, a Member of this Committee, but my memory does not carry me back so far as a meeting.

*Mr. MORTON: I will put another Question on the matter.

Negligent Parents.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of passing a Bill giving power to school authorities to prosecute parents who have failed, by their own default, to provide sufficient food for their children.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The advisability of extending the existing powers of prosecuting parents for neglecting their children was very fully considered and discussed by the Select Committee on the Education (Provision of Meals) Bill of last session. That Committee, after taking evidence on the question, decided that the existing powers arising under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904, Sections 3, 21, and 23, the Vagrancy Act of 1824, Sections 3 and 4, and to a certain extent under the Poor Law Act of 1899, and the Industrial Schools Act of 1866, are sufficient without giving the additional powers suggested in the Question.

Irish Bills.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister on what date it is proposed to introduce the Bill intended to provide for the establishment of an Irish Council.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot yet name a day for the introduction of either of the Bills in which the hon. Member is interested. I think my Answer covers his subsequent Question.

[The subsequent Question referred to was as follows—

To ask the Prime Minister on what date it is proposed to introduce the Bill intended to deal with the question of University education in Ireland.]

The Colonial Conference.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the Resolution unanimously passed at the annual meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, held in London on the 6th March, stating that the issue of the Colonial Conference will largely determine the nature of the future relations between the Mother Country and the Colonies, and therefere praying His Majesty's Government to afford a warm welcome to the Colonial representatives and so to conduct the negotiations that reciprocal trading within the Empire may be promoted and that the ties of sentiment may be supplemented by the equally strong ties of self-interest furnished by reciprocal trading; and what effect he can see his way to give to the Resolution.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I believe the terms of the Resolution are as stated. A cordial welcome will of course be given by His Majesty's Government to the Representatives of the Colonies whom we have invited to come to London. It seems hardly necessary for this body of gentlemen who constitute the Associated Chambers of Commerce to pray for such a reception. The subject of Preferential Trade, as the hon. Member is aware, occupies a prominent place on the list of the subjects for discussion.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL asked whether the right hon. Gentleman intended to take any steps in regard to the Resolution passed by the London Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday, by a majority of two to one, in favour of a change in our fiscal policy.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not see how that question arises out of my Answer.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when the Second Reading of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill is likely to be taken.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As soon as possible.

Answers to Questions.

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the inconvenience resulting from the fact that the official record of Answers to oral Questions is not available until after the lapse of eight days, he will consider the question of amending the Standing

Orders to the effect that Answers to oral Questions shall appear in the Votes and Proceedings of the ensuing day.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am disposed to think that the grievance in question is not very great. If a Member is absent from the House when Answers are given, he can generally see a report of what has passed in one or other of the papers the following day. My hon. friend will see that the printing of some eighty Questions and Answers would entail some expense; and, to make the Report complete, the Supplementary Questions and Answers would also have to be included. And that is a consideration which raises the larger and more difficult question, which has often been the subject of inquiry by Committees of this House, namely whether there should be an official record of what is said in the House as well as of what is done in it.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that very often it is difficult, owing to the noise in the House, to hear the Answers to Questions which really are important, and that when they are neither heard nor reported, one has to wait eight days before he can ascertain the Answer. Would not time be saved by printing the Answers as suggested?

[No Answer was returned.]

Land Valuation Bills.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the statement in the King's Speech that it is the intention of the Government to introduce this session Bills for the valuation of land in Scotland and also in England and Wales, he can say when these Bills are likely to be introduced.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid that I am not in a position to make a statement at present.

Hexham Election.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the returning officer in the recent election in the Hexham Division postponed the election for nearly a week after the date desired by the representatives of both parties, and that excessive excitement and some disturbance developed during that period of delay; whether he will consider the introduction of legislation for shortening the period between the issue of the writ and the election day, and for the limitation of the discretion of the returning officer, especially in the case of county elections.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the reason given by the High Sheriff for the postponement was his determination to attend the Grand National, which he understood was a horse race.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that the polling day was delayed at the recent election in the Hexham Division. The delay may have been undesirable and have led to unfortunate consequences, but we must presume that there were strong reasons for it, based upon public duty. I believe that returning officers are usually quite willing to fix the date of polling so as to meet the general convenience of all parties in the constituency, and that it would be undesirable to limit further the period elapsing before the election, as such limitations might work unfairly.

Charity Commission Vote.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Vote for the Charity Commissioners has not been discussed in this House since 1902, but guillotined with other Votes, amounting in the aggregate to several millions; and whether he can promise that during the present session an opportunity will be afforded the House for discussing the Vote for the Charity Commissioners, and, if possible, for discussing all other Votes, in order that the practice which during the last ten years has grown up, of voting millions of money without a word of explanation or any information upon the subject being afforded to the House, shall be terminated.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Government are entirely in the hands of the House in this matter; and if a general desire is expressed for a discussion of this Vote we shall be glad to put it down on one of the allotted days.

The Committee of Defence.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a visit was paid to British stations in the Mediterranean during 1906 by or on behalf of members of the Committee of Defence; if so, whether those who paid such visit set out with any definite instructions; whether he can give any information as to those instructions, if any; what was the expenditure incurred in connection with the visit; and upon what Estimates presented to Parliament has such expenditure been charged.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. A Committee was appointed by the Secretary of State for War with three representatives appointed by the Admiralty to visit the Mediterranean stations and to report whether any revision of the armaments was necessary to bring them into harmony with certain principles laid down by the Admiralty and approved by the Committee of Imperial Defence. It must be evident that instructions thus arising cannot be made public. As H.M.S. "Terrible" was proceeding to the East with relief crews, and as her captain was a member of the Committee, the Admiralty allowed the other members to proceed on board this ship.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman say if the military authorities gave evidence before the Committee?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked for notice.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: Was any definite authority given to the Committee to increase or decrease the expenditure on defence?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Perhaps the noble Lord will put the Question down.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District): I greatly regret to have to trouble the House with a personal explanation, but certain circumstances have arisen which constrain me to ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes. An hon. Member of this House has seen fit to go into my constituency and to make allegations against myself amounting to this: That the votes which I have given in support of the Government from time to time are not votes which have been freely and conscientiously given, but are votes which, in effect, the Government have purchased by monetary payment to me through the Liberal Party. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, speaking in Wrexham, in my constituency, on 24th March, said—

> "Clement Edwards is paid by Liberal money. Clement Edwards and I have been friends for twenty years; but remember, if the Liberals are going to pay your member they are going to claim his vote in the House of Commons."

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that I should not have found it necessary to trouble the House, but that I should have been able by means of correspondence with the hon. Member to have got a withdrawal of the statement. I wrote to him on 28th March, as follows:—

> "My dear Keir Hardie,
>
> "From the local papers I see you are reported as saying in your speech last Sunday in my constituency that Clement Edwards is paid by Liberal money. I need not say that this statement that I am paid by the Liberal Party is entirely false, and I must ask you to withdraw it. You and I may differ, as we do, in political methods, but this difference does not justify you in abusing your Parliamentary position by going into my constituency and deliberately circulating statements of a personal character which you must know to be untrue.
>
> "Awaiting your reply, yours truly,
>
> "CLEMENT EDWARDS."

On the following day I received a reply from the hon. Member as follows:—

> "Dear Edwards,
>
> "The terms of your letter are such as almost to preclude reply. I have not seen the paper from which you purport to quote, nor do I recognise in the alleged quotation anything said by me at Wrexham on Sunday last.
>
> "Yours faithfully.
>
> "KEIR HARDIE."

On the following day I sent the following letter:—

> "My dear Hardie,
>
> "I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 29th, and have taken the trouble to procure the report of your speech in three local papers which I enclose. You will see that you are reported in all of them as having said that 'Clement Edwards is paid

by Liberal money.' This, as I said before, is entirely untrue, and I must ask you to withdraw the statement without qualification so that the withdrawal may have the same publicity as the original statement.

"Awaiting your reply, yours truly,
"CLEMENT EDWARDS."

The newspaper cuttings I sent were from the *North Wales Guardian*—a Conservative paper—and the *Wrexham Advertiser*, a Liberal Paper.

I waited for a week and did not get a reply. Thereupon, on 8th April, I wrote to the hon. Member as follows:—

"Dear Keir Hardie,

"In default of a letter from you withdrawing your untrue statement at Wrexham that I am paid by Liberal money, I have had consultation with the Speaker on the matter. With his sanction I propose raising the question in the House on Thursday afternoon, unless in the meantime I get a withdrawal of the statement from you. If you are not able to be in your place on Thursday afternoon I shall be glad of a note from you saying which day you will be.

"Yours truly,
"CLEMENT EDWARDS."

The hon. Member replied on the 9th April, 1907:—

"Dear Edwards,

"On my return to London last evening I found your letter dated 2nd April and also your further communication of 8th April.

"I have again to repeat that I do not recognise in the Press cuttings anything that I said at Wrexham.

"I hope to be in my place on Thursday when the House meets.

"Yours very truly,
"J. KEIR HARDIE."

To this I answered on the same day:—

"Dear Hardie,

"I have yours of this date. You repeat that you do not recognise in the Press cuttings anything that you said at Wrexham. This is neither conclusive nor satisfactory.

"The passage in question could not have been invented by all the newspapers. Perhaps you will kindly tell me in what respects the Press reports are inaccurate, and what you really did say,

"Yours truly,
"CLEMENT EDWARDS."

The hon. Member's reply, dated 9th April, was as follows:—

"Dear Edwards,

"Had the question with which yours of yesterday's date concludes been put in either your first or second communication, I should have answered it.

"Since, however, you have seen fit to give the Press notice of your intention to raise the matter in the House, I shall wait until I have heard your statement before making any reply, and make it in such form as to ensure equal publicity with your statement.

"Yours truly,
"J. KEIR HARDIE."

I only desire to add that there is not one single word of truth in these allegations. It is perfectly true that, in common, I believe, with the poorer Members of every Party in this House, I received a small portion of my election expenses, I myself, out of my own pocket, finding the great bulk. No pledge, however, was asked of me, and no pledge was given. The statement that I have been paid by Liberal money, and that in consequence I have been required to vote in a certain way in this House, is absolutely and entirely untrue. I leave it to the hon. Member for Merthyr either to substantiate the statement or to withdraw it.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I made no such statement. I was not referring to the hon. Member. I was addressing a meeting in what I subsequently learnt to be his constituency. I was conducting an argument to show that the Labour Party, since it paid its own Members by funds subscribed by trade unionists, was an independent Party. I pointed out that, because the working people of North Wales had trusted the Liberal and Conservative Parties, not one Labour Member had been returned from North Wales. That is the point at which the hon. Member takes up my statement, and tells half the truth concerning it. At this stage someone in the meeting shouted "Clement Edwards," and his supporters cheered. Others derided the statement, and in the midst of the noise I replied, "Clement Edwards has his election expenses paid by the Liberal Party." Someone said, "No, no," and I repeated, "paid by the Liberal Party," and proceeded with my argument, that if a Party paid its Members it expected their votes. I do not suppose the Liberal Party would pay Members to vote against it [AN HON. MEMBER: It is a quibble.] The point I want to make is that, but for the interruption, the hon. Member's name would never have been introduced. It was the pure interjection of his name by one of his own supporters that led to the matter being mentioned at all. I repeat what I said in my letter, that if he had not blazoned abroad that he was going to raise this question to-day, if he had not assumed that the report in the Press was correct, he would have had a correct report, as I have now given it to him; but he preferred to assume the report was correct, and proceeded to demand a withdrawal and a public apology.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS: I did not ask for a public apology.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: I shall read the letter.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS: Do so.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (reading the letter)—

> "This was entirely untrue, and I am asking you to withdraw the statement without qualification so that the withdrawal may have the same publicity as the original untrue statement."

An HON. MEMBER: Where is the demand for an apology?

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: The apology was demanded in the first letter. [Cries of "Read it"!]

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: I regret the time of the House has been wasted over this matter. If I had cared to bring every case of this kind before the House in which I have been charged by hon. Members and the Press tipsters of the Party opposite with being in the pay of the Tory Party, supported by Tory gold, this House would never have been free of such complaints. I repeat that what I said was that the hon. Member had his election expenses paid, and I went on to add that I had no personal feeling against the hon. Member. I was not referring to him, but it was a general statement of principles. I said, and I repeat, that a Party which pays a Member or pays the expenses of a Member expects that Member to vote for the Party in the House of Commons.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS: Do I understand that the hon. Member——

*Mr. SPEAKER: I think the incident should close now.

Lord R. CECIL asked whether the statement made by the hon. Member at Wrexham was not a breach of the privileges of the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think there was any breach.

Lord R. CECIL: I meant the original statement made at Wrexham.

*Mr. SPEAKER: No, I did consider the matter from that point of view, and I came to the conclusion that it did not amount to a breach of privilege.

The subject then dropped.

RESIGNATION OF LORD CROMER.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): I have to ask the leave of the House to read an announcement which I make with the deepest regret. Lord Cromer has, under medical advice, decided that it is necessary for him to resign for reasons of health; and I think it is best that I should read to the House the announcement in his own words—

> "I have arrived at the conclusion that I must ask you to accept my resignation. I have done so after very full consideration and consultation with my medical adviser and Sir Stephen Mackenzie, who is here. I am most anxious that it should be particularly understood that the reasons which have induced me to take this step are wholly due to the state of my health, and that no political considerations of any kind whatever are in any way connected with it. More especially I desire to say that nothing could be more effective or generous than the manner in which the present Government has supported me. It has been the greatest pleasure to me to serve under you, and it is with extreme regret that I shall break my official connection with you. After spending, however, forty-nine years in the public service, I am thoroughly worn out, and I am really unable to support any longer the excessive strain which my work entails. I feel also that I do not possess the health and strength which are necessary to do justice to all the very important interests involved. Both doctors are quite agreed that it is necessary that I should give up my work."

The news has caused the greatest regret to us, and will do so to the House. To me personally it means more than I can express. We have relied upon and placed our confidence in Lord Cromer, as successive British Governments have done for so many years. Some further correspondence has passed in the hope that Lord Cromer's decision might not be final; but, in view of the fact that the recovery of his health (of which, I am glad to think, there is the prospect) depends absolutely upon his retirement, we have been obliged to accept his decision. There will be other opportunities for dwelling more at length upon his work in Egypt; but I should like to say at once that it is the object of His Majesty's Government to maintain that work and to continue the policy which has been inspired by him, and of which a most admirable exposition is contained in his last Report just presented to Parliament. I do not underrate the difficulty of continuing without him the work which has been so dependent upon him. His retirement from Egypt is the greatest personal loss which the public service of this country could suffer. In the early years of the British occupation, in view of all the difficulties in Egypt and elsewhere, the success achieved by him would have seemed incredible, but for the fact that he accomplished it. And if in later years progress has been facilitated by the prestige and confidence which have attached to the occupation, it is by Lord Cromer himself that the prestige and confidence have been created. The King has approved the appointment of Sir Eldon Gorst to the vacancy at Cairo—an appointment which has been made after consultation with Lord Cromer. Sir Eldon Gorst has special knowledge of Egypt; there is no one who has possessed to a greater degree Lord Cromer's confidence or has been more closely associated with him personally in his work, and I am confident that this choice is the one best calculated to maintain and continue it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): With your permission, Sir, and with the permission of the House, perhaps it would not be inappropriate that I should say one word in respect to the statement just made by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The regret which he has expressed will be felt in an unqualified degree, I believe, by every man of every Party in the House and in the country. It is only history which can give an adequate estimate of the work Lord Cromer has done in Egypt; but we know enough and can survey with sufficient accuracy the magnitude of his work to feel how marvellous are the moral and material labours which he has gone through and to admire the manner in which, under international and other difficulties which might well have wearied out the patience of any less resolute administrator, he has carried through the great task committed to him. This is, perhaps, not the occasion, nor is it my province, to comment on the appointment of the successor His Majesty has named, in conformity with the advice of his responsible Ministers; but all who know Sir Eldon Gorst know how great are the abilities he possesses and how unequalled is his knowledge of recent Egyptian development, and, above all, how anxious he will be to carry out intact the policy which has been so marvellously accomplished by his great predecessor, whose loss to the public service we all lament. We wish him every success.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked as to the business for next week.

Sir H CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that, as a provisional arrangement, it was proposed to take Navy Supply on Monday—Votes 10, 2, 13, 14, 15, and other Votes, but not Votes 8, 9, and 12. On Tuesday the debate on the Second Reading of the Army Bill would be finished, according to what he understood to be an agreement. On Wednesday the Second Reading of the Patents Bill and the Butter Bill would probably be taken, and on Thursday the Budget. This arrangement was made on the supposition that the discussion on the Rules of Procedure would be concluded that night. If that could not be done—he did not wish to be unreasonable—the arrangement for Monday would be altered, and, if it was understood that the discussion of the Procedure Rules would be ended on Monday night, he would take that instead of Navy Supply. Two days for that discussion should surely satisfy hon. Gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.), in reference to the course of business, inquired whether, as two modifications had been placed on the Paper with regard to the new Rules of Procedure, one of which had reference to Standing Committees, the Prime Minister would endeavour to make arrangements that the discussion with regard to the Scottish Grand Committee should not take place in the small hours of the morning.

[No Answer was returned.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Irish Tobacco Bill: Mr. Runciman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Gordon, Colonel M'Calmont, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Boland, Mr. Gwynn, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Dolan, Mr. Hazleton, and Mr. Reddy.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

BLIND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION, ETC.) BILL.

"To provide for the Technical Education, Employment, and Maintenance of the Blind," presented by Mr. Steadman; supported by Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Clynes, Mr. Jowett, and Mr. Ward; to be read a second time upon Friday, 10th May, and to be printed. [Bill 148.]

SMALL HOLDINGS (No. 3) BILL.

"To further facilitate the provision of Small Holdings in England and Wales," presented by Mr. George Hardy; supported by Sir Francis Channing, Mr. Lynch, Mr. George White, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Levy Lever, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Vickerman Rutherford, Mr. Essex, Mr. Rowlands, and Mr. Stephen Collins; to be read a second time upon Friday, 10th May, and to be printed. [Bill 149.]

OPEN SPACES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To facilitate the acquisition of Open Spaces by Local Authorities in Scotland," presented by Mr. M'Crae; supported by Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Younger, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Cleland, and Mr. Dundas White; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 150.]

PATENTS AND DESIGNS (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Patents and Designs; presented by Mr. Dundas White; supported by Dr. Shipman, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Findlay, and Mr. Henry Anderson Watt; to be read a second time upon Friday, 26th April, and to be printed. [Bill 151.]

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters; and for other purposes relating to Elections," presented by Mr. Cremer; supported by Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Bell, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. John Ward, Mr. Maddison, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham); to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 152.]

TRUST INVESTMENT BILL.

"To amend the Law as to the Investment of Trust Funds in municipal and other similar securities and as to the Investment of any money which local authorities are authorised or required to invest," presented by Mr. Harmood-Banner; supported by Mr. Armitage and Mr. Scott; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 153.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the proceedings on the Consideration of the Business of the House (Procedure) have precedence this day of the Business of Supply."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 324; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 103.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)

Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'm'rset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'l

Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh.
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.

Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelly, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare

Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Atheistan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Br'df'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliffe, Major R. F.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Consideration of the Business of the House (Procedure), if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the

Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 320; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 104.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott- (Som'set
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'l
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.

Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil Williams
Dussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal, (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Starboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sutherland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. de R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour, Rt Hn. A.J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'd
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark

Thornton, Percy M.	Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)	**Tellers for the Noes**—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.
Turnour, Viscount	Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)	
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard	Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm	
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)	Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George	
Walrond, Hon. Lionel	Younger, George	

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That Mr. Lonsdale be discharged from the Committee of Public Accounts.

Ordered, That Mr. Bowles be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [20th March] as amended :—" (1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be dedecided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to—(a) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills ; or (b) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall without further Debate put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) moved as an Amendment to insert "or Bills involving any aid, grant, or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of money to be provided by the Public Revenue, or involving any charge upon the people." The rule proposed by the Prime Minister, he said, contained the general proposition to send upstairs to Grand Committees as many Bills as possible, with the exception of Bills imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills. By the present procedure such a Bill was read a first time when there was practically no opportunity for discussion. On the Second Reading it was not strictly in order, as he gathered from reading the Standing Orders, to discuss in detail the charge to be placed upon public funds or upon the people, the charge appearing in blank or in italics in the Bill. According to the present practice, that portion of the Bill was reserved exclusively for consideration in Committee of the Whole House, which had the right, he might say the ancient privilege, of dealing with the method of raising the money. When the Bill came up on Report, he found it laid down by May that it was distinctly irregular, and not permitted in the House on the Report stage, to discuss the method of providing the money. Occasionally a Member was able to get in some observation on some of these points on Report ; but, strictly speaking, criticism of the details of the ways and means of imposing the tax was the exclusive privilege of the Committee of the Whole House. Another point was that these matters were barred from consideration by the other House. Not only from the point of view of the other House but from the point of view of the House of Commons, Committee of the Whole House was the only place where this particular kind of subject could be fully discussed and dealt with. The effect of the rule, as proposed by the Prime Minister, was, as he gathered, that a considerable number of Bills which came within this category would be sent upstairs for the Committee stage to be dealt with in all the privacy and absence of discussion by Members of the House which the proposal involved. That was a point which was sought to be remedied by his Amendment. He desired to make clear by it that every kind of measure which involved any charge whatever upon the people should be taken in Committee of the Whole House. It might be replied that the Government by their proposal meant the same thing as he described by his Amendment. The words he had taken from Standing Order No. 71, which, he thought, contained the most reliable description of the kind of Bill which ought to be so considered. Standing Order 71 said :—" If any Motion be made in the House for any aid, grant, or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, or for any charge upon the people," and so on, " shall be referred to Committee of the Whole House." They had there the exact words of what was not to be sent up to a Committee, but following the present and ancient practice of this House should be reserved for consideration in Committee of the Whole House.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Sir HENRY FOWLER, (Wolverhampton, E.): But that will remain as it is.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said if that was the case surely it would lead to confusion to have in the new Standing Order one description and to have a totally different description in Standing Order No. 71. The simplest course would be to accept his Amendment. But the Prime Minister had said that he absolutely declined to accept any of these Amendments. He wished for a moment to refer to the constitution of the proposed Committee to which the kind of Bill to which he referred would necessarily be referred. If every hon. Member had a right to sit upon the Grand Committee there would not be so much objection to the Standing Order as it was now proposed, but they had to be selected in a certain manner, and a large number of hon. Members would not have the right to sit upon the Grand Committee. All hon. Members who did not happen to be on a given Grand Committee dealing with a particular Bill a part of which involved a charge upon the people would be precluded from discussing in detail that portion of the Bill. That was a very serious matter, involving, as it did, a great constitutional change. He would like to remind hon. Members that the present Government might only be temporary. They all admired the high character of the present Government. A great man had said with great truth that—

> "Governments as a rule were standing conspiracies to rob and bamboozle."

That was a quotation from Richard Cobden. They recognised in the Prime Minister and his colleagues lofty intelligence, the most honourable conduct, and marvellous honesty, but it was conceivable that in two or three years somebody very different might occupy their places. Only two years ago there sat on the Treasury Bench a Government which did not possess the galaxy of talent and virtue of the present Government, and two years hence there might be a Labour Government in power with one of the hon. Members below the Gangway as Prime Minister. Governments changed, and sometimes changed for the worse, and the Party opposite in adopting new procedure rules were apt to forget that they were not the only persons who might take advantage of the facilities afforded. If this rule were not amended it would give a power which might impose burdens upon the people without the right of complete detailed discussion in that House. It would place that power in the hands not only of the present Government but of any future Government. The right of adequate criticism by the people's representatives of matters involving financial burdens was being taken away by the Prime Minister. One of the cardinal principles of the British Constitution was that the elected representatives of the people had the right to criticise freely and to object to any suggested new burden, but these new rules, if amended, would deprive them of that right. There was a suggestion that in the procedure rules now under consideration it was intended to pack these Committees, and that the Government were going to take very good care that they would be a large preponderance of their own supporters. Such a Committee, packed by a majority of the Government's own servile supporters, might be presided over by an hon. Member who would not occupy the lofty and independent position of Mr. Speaker, nor even that of the Chairman of Ways and Means, who was so conspicuous for his ability, his judgment, and his fairness. Therefore the Committee, to which a Bill to impose a burden on the people might be sent, might be presided over by a mere Party flunkey. [Cries of " Order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I think the hon. and learned Member is permitting himself too much licence in saying that about the future Chairman of a Committee.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he was only contemplating such a thing at some future day. He quite understood that the Chairman of such a Committee would not occupy the position of Mr. Speaker or of the Chairman of Ways and Means, who did not take any part in the political struggles and votes of the day. It was not proposed to extend that independence to the Chairmen of Grand Committees, and therefore he thought they would not be in such an independent and lofty position. To deprive hon. Members of the right to criticise and discuss in detail the imposition of a financial burden was an intolerable proposition. That was the effect of the proposal of the Prime Minister. On page 558 of Sir Erskine May's book there occurred the words "the Commons have for centuries faithfully maintained," and so on, referring to the rights and privileges of the Members of the House of Commons. After having been maintained faithfully for centuries, it was now proposed to abolish those rights and privileges. The Government were proposing to hand over the control and power of the House to a Committee upstairs. He would not labour this point further by entering into anything like a historical survey of the position, but he would like to state that the historian Green had pointed out that

> "the principle of all taxation granted by and all burdens imposed upon the people of this realm rested upon their voluntary consent given through their freely elected representatives."

From Henry III. down to the Tudors, towns which did not send representatives to Parliament could not be taxed, and it was a breach of that privilege which he was endeavouring to explain to the House, because a large number of members would be precluded from participating in the discussion of proposals dealing with fresh financial burdens. No taxation and no financial burdens ought to be imposed without an opportunity for full, complete, and unrestricted discussion in Parliament by the whole of the accredited representatives of all those who were going to be called upon to pay those taxes or bear those burdens. The Standing Orders which at present related to this matter were the oldest Standing Orders of the House. The Amendment was not a Party Amendment at all. It was simply a protest on behalf of the liberty, independence, and privileges of every Member of the House. He was afraid it was no use appealing to the Members of the Government to accept the Amendment, but he appealed for support to every Member of the House who was capable of being reached by argument or in any other way. He begged to move.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) seconded the Amendment. He concurred with the mover that if it were left to the judgment and the reason of the House the Amendment would be carried. It was a most important, and not in any way a Party Amendment. It was most unfortunate that such an Amendment should be considered in so small a House. The right to deal with questions of Supply had been a right of the representatives of the people since, as his hon. friend had said, the days of Magna Charta. All the disputes between the Crown and the House, in the days of Charles I., and also in preceding and succeeding times, arose on financial questions. The disputes were over the claim of the House to have the controlling power in matters of Supply. It had been understood that after what was in fact a Resolution the House obtained the power which it now possessed. It was never contemplated that it would of its own free will give up that power and put it into the hands of any Government, however wise they might be at any particular moment. It was not a question whether any given Government was capable or trustworthy. They were now deciding, probably for many years to come, a most momentous question. Private Members were asked to part with a right which they had won after many struggles, prolonged over a great number of years—to part with it to a certain number of men who happened by fortuitous circumstances to be the Government of the day. On questions of imposing or regulating taxes, or appropriating any part of the money raised by taxes, every private Member had as much right to be present and to record his vote as any right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton had stated in reply to an interruption of his hon. friend, that the Order provided for money Resolutions being considered in the House. He did not see how the right hon. Gentleman was going to justify that proposition. He supposed the right hon. Gentleman would say that a Bill containing money clauses would have those clauses in italics, and that one part of the Bill would be referred to a Grand Committee, while the clauses in italics would be referred to Committee of the Whole House. But they must not take it for granted that because the present Government were prepared to do that, their successors would be prepared to do the same thing. They must see that the rules were so drawn that there would be no possible chance of a Government in the future avoiding the carrying out of the present intention of the right hon. Gentleman. The intention ought to be stated in the new Standing Order even if he was unable to accept the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the West Derby Division. Though the Amendment would be a considerable advance on the Standing Order, it would not in his opinion meet the case at all. Supposing the Standing Order was amended and the clauses in italics must be considered by Committee of the Whole House, the only question that could arise would be as to taking the money out of the Consolidated Fund. The question whether it was advisable to do that or not could not arise. A majority of the Members of the House would not be able, when a Bill was in Committee upstairs, to express an opinion on it though it was in respect of the Bill that the money was to be obtained. That seemed to him to be an extremely important point, and he hoped the Government would not lose sight of it. Supposing the Standing Order was passed in the form in which it was introduced, and a Bill which did not impose a tax but took money from the Consolidated Fund—and it was practically the same thing—was sent upstairs to be dealt with by a Grand Committee consisting of sixty to eighty Members, how was that Committee to be chosen? He had been reading the debates which took place in 1882, when the Grand Committees were instituted. It was pointed out by, he thought, Lord Randolph Churchill, that the manner of choosing the Members of the Committees was open to considerable objection. It was pointed out that the Committees were chosen practically by the Whips of the Parties. The Members put on the Committee by the Whips would be chosen because the Whips knew that they were not likely to give any great trouble.

Sir J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): No.

Sir F. BANBURY said he understood why the right hon. Gentleman said "no." It was because the Members were nominated by the Committee of Selection. Of course the right hon. Gentleman paid no attention to the Patronage Secretary when he said that a certain Member should be on a Committee.

Sir J. BRUNNER: He never does it. It is done by the Committee of Selection, who represent the several Parties in the House.

Sir F. BANBURY pointed out that the Members of the Selection Committee were chosen by the Whips.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): They are chosen by the House. I am a Member of the Committee of Selection, and I am there in opposition to the Whips.

Sir F. BANBURY said the hon. Gentleman might be the exception to the rule. It might have been impossible to keep him off the Committee. It was perfectly well known that the Members of the Committee of Selection were appointed with the approval of the Whips. That could not be denied. It was quite possible that the members of the Committee of Selection representing their Party might, from a Party interest, put on men on whom they could rely. [Ministerial cries of "Order."]

Mr. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was anticipating discussion on the Amendment to Standing Order 48.

Sir F. BANBURY said when a Bill dealing with a money question or taking money out of the Consolidated Fund came before a Standing Committee no declaration was made by the members of the Committee, as in the case of private Bills, that they were not interested in it.

If a Bill went to a large Grand Committee, say of sixty Members, those Members would be chosen before it was known what Bills would be brought before them; and what was to prevent, quite by accident, of course, a large number of the Members being interested themselves or through their constituents in those Bills? That would apply especially to the Scottish Grand Committee. The money would have to be found by Members who were not on the Committee, and when the Bill came downstairs the opportunity of discussing the financial details would be gone. He thought that was a very important consideration, especially for English Members, for it must not be forgotten that they and their constituents paid the great bulk of the taxes and rates of the country, and, so far as he could see, the English Members would stand a very poor chance of exercising any control over those Bills if this Rule were passed. His hon. friend had observed that this Standing Order, unless amended, would place the whole power of Parliament in the hands of the Government of the day. He was rather inclined to agree with his hon. friend. It seemed an extraordinary result of the last general election that the Liberal Party, after all their declarations about the late Government having muzzled the House of Commons and taken the power out of the hands of private Members, should now come down and propose to take away from private Members this most important asset and privilege, which they had enjoyed from time immemorial. He sincerely hoped that the Government would reconsider their position. He begged to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 9, after the word 'Bills,' to insert the words 'or Bills involving any aid, grant, or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of money to be provided by Parliament, or involving any charge upon the people.'"—(*Mr. William Rutherford*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that they had heard from the mover and seconder of the Amendment some interesting references to the constitutional rights of the people of this country and their representatives in regard to taxation. If there was a shadow of a shade of reality in what the two hon. Gentlemen had said in reference to any possibility, on the part of the Government, of interfering with what they regarded as the most sacred principle of the Constitution, viz., the supremacy of the House of Commons over all the expenditure of public money, he would as strongly protest against it as they did. If the House would allow him he would explain the procedure. There was what was called a Money Bill, which imposed taxation for the use of the State. Such a Bill could only be introduced in Committee of the Whole House. No Money Bill could be introduced by a private Member; and the Government of the day could only bring in such a Bill in Committee of the Whole House with the previous sanction of the Crown. The late Prime Minister had candidly confessed that his opinion in regard to Money Bills did not coincide with that of Lord St. Aldwyn and the late Sir William Harcourt. There was another class of Bills which were not Money Bills.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked if the right hon. Gentleman before he went further would tell the House what he proposed to do with a Money Bill in its later course? His hon. friend had been dealing with what would happen on the Committee stage.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that what the hon. Gentleman had argued was that the House was being deprived by this new Procedure Rule of some power which it now possessed over Money Bills. That was not so. The next kind of Bill was one which contained a money clause, and such a clause was always printed in italics to show that it would have to be referred to and discussed in Committee of the Whole House. There were, therefore, two protections in regard to Money Bills. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer asked what they were going to do with those Bills at a future stage. The answer was that those Bills were outside the scope of the proposed new Standing Order. That Order would not apply to Bills for imposing taxes, or taking money out of the Consolidated Fund, or to Appropriation Bills. Let him read what the law said—

> "If the main object of a Bill is to impose a charge upon the public revenues of the United Kingdom or of India, or upon the people, or to appropriate any money so charged, or to release or compound a sum of money due to the Crown, its introduction must be preceded and authorised by a Resolution of a Committee of the Whole House. This Resolution must be recommended by the Crown, and must be agreed to by the House before the Bill is introduced."

There were no words in the English language which could be clearer than those.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that they did not touch a Bill which contained a money clause.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said he was dealing with the introduction of Money Bills. They could not be introduced unless they had been sanctioned by a Resolution passed by a Committee of the Whole House, and previously recommended by the Crown. The words of the Amendment of the hon. Member had absolutely no meaning, and the House had been occupied for a whole hour in discussing a fiction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that with all respect he really thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had mistaken the argument of his hon. friend the Member for the West Derby division of Liverpool, and that he had also entirely mistaken the effect of the proposed new Standing Order. The right hon. Gentleman had dwelt upon the precautions which had come down among other ancient traditions that any Bill which imposed charges on the public funds should be introduced in Committee of the Whole House. He had stated in evidence before the Committee upstairs that that was no protection but a mere embarrassment in these days. That, however, had nothing to do with the contention of his two hon. friends. Passing from the first stage of the Bill to the Second Reading, on that point he had nothing to say, as it would be unaffected by this proposal. Then he came to the third stage, which was the Committee, and as to that he really thought the right hon. Gentleman had left the House in a very dangerous condition of doubt. They all agreed that a Bill that imposed taxes, such as a Budget Bill, was one which could not go upstairs, but he would ask whether a Bill that was not one for imposing taxes, but which incidentally imposed taxes whether that would go upstairs.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said that such a Bill would go to a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if that was the view of the right hon. Gentleman he must alter Sub-section (a) of the Standing Order and except Bills involving charges, and he was sure after the explicit statement which he had made on behalf of the Government he would be content to accept such an Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had said that every Bill involving a charge must, in the nature of the case, in the Committee stage be discussed in the Whole House. If that was the view of the Government he admitted that they had gone a long way to meet their views, but they had not embodied that view in the Standing Order. He would, by way of illustration, take two concrete cases which would make it perfectly clear. The Army Bill which was now before the House had a clause which did impose a charge, and that clause could only be inserted after leave had been obtained in Committee of the Whole House; but as they read this original Resolution they were under the impression, in spite of that, that it would be in the power of the Government to send it upstairs, until the right hon. Gentleman assured them that that was not so. He saw on the front bench opposite one right hon. Gentleman nodding assent and another negativing the suggestion, while the Prime Minister had so far maintained a discreet immobility. At all events, it was quite clear to anyone who heard the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy that, in his opinion, neither the Army Bill of this year nor the Education

Bill of last could have been sent to a Committee upstairs. But was that the meaning of the Standing Order? If they had not passed the words he would like to move a slight verbal alteration which would make it quite clear that no Bill in which there was a clause involving a charge should go upstairs, and he thought that would meet the views of the mover and the seconder of the Amendment. He thought the Government would see with the Chancellor of the Duchy that that policy was really the right one, and he would tell the House why. Under the Standing Orders of the House it was possible for the Committee of the Whole House to make alterations in the money part of a Bill and those changes could not be touched upon Report. Supposing the money provision of a Bill imposing a charge upon the people was brought in in Committee and that Bill was sent upstairs under the Standing Order, as he read it it would then be in the power of the eighty Members composing that Committee or such a quorum as attended, to transfer the whole of that charge from the taxes to the rates, and when it came back to the House and was discussed upon Report it would not be competent for the Whole House to discuss the matter and re-transfer that charge from the rates to the taxes. There were a great many other limitations on the Report stage which did not apply to the Committee stage. He had given one of a striking character, and he thought everyone would admit that they ought not to give up to a Committee of eighty Gentlemen power to do that with a Bill which the Whole House could reverse only by recommitting the Bill and going through the elaborate machinery which had been gone through upstairs. He thought that was a most dangerous condition in which to leave the matter, but he would not elaborate the point as he believed he was forcing an open door. As the President of the Board of Education shook his head, he thought it would be only fair to him if he were informed from the Treasury Bench whether the policy he was to deal with was that of the Chancellor of the Duchy or that of the Minister for Education. He could not speak again and he would hand to his right hon. friend near him, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, the duty of continuing the debate, having regard to the difference of view between the Chancellor of the Duchy and that of the Minister for Education. If the view of the Chancellor of the Duchy was right their views were met, and it would be impossible to send to a Committee upstairs any Bill imposing a charge. That was all they asked for, and the discussion might at once come to an amicable termination if the Prime Minister, sitting in discreet immobility, like Aaron, between his two supporters, would get up and decide which was the correct view.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): Was it not Solomon?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; not Solomon. The right hon. Gentleman has many resemblances to Solomon, but Solomon had to do not with two supporters but with two babies. [Cries of "No; one baby."] The right hon. Gentleman continuing said he must apologise to the House for having shown that simple Bible teaching was still necessary. What they wanted from the Prime Minister was a statement of whether it was the view of his colleague on his right or the view of his inestimably valuable colleague on his left that was to be given effect to.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman professed to have discovered a discordance between his right hon. friend and himself in regard to this subject, but it did not exist. The question was a very simple one. The difference arose between the two classes of Bills: those which involved a charge and those which imposed a tax. Bills which imposed a tax were exempted from the operation of the Standing Order, but Bills which involved a charge were not. The reason for this was obvious. Let them take, for instance, an ordinary Factory Act Amendment Bill in which there were fifty provisions dealing with the intricate provisions of the Factory Law which everybody would at once agree should go upstairs, and which would go upstairs. But the Bill might and probably would contain a clause providing for the appointment of an inspector, and that would involve a charge. The Bill itself did not provide the money; it did not impose any taxes which would do so, but the House would have the fullest opportunity of criticising that charge in Committee of the House when the money was voted on the Estimates. The Bill itself did not impose that charge, it merely provided for the appointment of a particular official who would subsequently be appointed and paid for by a Vote of the House which could be fully discussed in Committee. The whole case put forward by the hon. Members who moved and seconded the Amendment was really founded on a misapprehension of the facts. It was absolutely true as stated by his right hon. friend that a particular class of Bills which involved a charge must be introduced in Committee of the Whole House, and therefore he agreed that in regard to that class the House would have an opportunity in Committee and on Report of criticising the particular charge. The House had these two opportunities of discussing the matter, and if its attention was called to any wicked action of the Government, when the charge came before the House on the Estimates they could refuse to find the money. Even if such a Bill were carried through Report and Third Reading, if there was any element of surprise in it and hon. Members thought they had not had an opportunity of raising any question they could state their objections upon the Estimates.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD asked what guarantee they had of any discussion.

MR. McKENNA said he supposed the hon. Member meant that the Government might move the closure, but the hon. Member had this guarantee. Estimates were put down by arrangement with hon. Gentlemen opposite, and if there was any case of surprise or of the other side being taken unawares all they had to do was to ask the Chief Government Whip to put down for discussion the particular Estimate raising the question. There was no doubt that under this Resolution as it stood the House would be given an opportunity of expressing its opinion as to the charge. If on the other hand the House were misled into accepting the Amendment by the entirely imaginary dangers alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman, it would mean that the very class of Bill which ought to go upstairs, such as a Factory Bill involving the appointment of inspectors or a Local Government Bill full of numerous details and involving the appointment of some medical inspector, would be precluded from being so dealt with. They might usefully take the course suggested by the Government. The hon. Gentleman had put forward a case of a charge on the taxes in the original Bill being altered upstairs into a charge on the rates and then said, with some truth, that any change of that character could not be altered on Report. But the Bill could be recommitted. It was perfectly open to move that the Bill be recommitted; the same questions would then arise, and the merits of the question would be discussed. Therefore he did not think the statement of the hon. Gentleman was strictly accurate. The Bill could either be recommitted upstairs on that particular clause or it could be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: Where is that preserved?

MR. McKENNA: The new Standing Order doe that.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: I did not see that.

MR. McKENNA said it was there, and that being so there was no danger. He thought therefore the House could accept this Resolution without hesitation.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said the House was indebted to the right hon. Gentleman for his clear and lucid explanation, but anyone who followed the speech of the right hon. Gentleman and heard also that of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster would see that one statement was a flat contradiction of the other. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education had divided Bills imposing a charge on the public into two classes, Bills which imposed taxes, which the new Standing Order would retain in the House, and Bills which incidentally, without raising a tax, imposed a charge without providing the means by which that charge was to be met. That was in flat contradiction to what was stated by the Chancellor of the Duchy, who objected to the words moved by the hon. Member on the ground that they were surplusage. The words were not surplusage if the interpretation of the new Standing Order given by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education was correct. It would be as well perhaps, if the Prime Minister would enlighten the House on this point. Was it the intention of the Government that such a Bill as the Army Bill should go upstairs? He asked the Prime Minister to give the House a definite statement, such as only the right hon. Gentleman himself could give, as to who was right, the Chancellor of the Duchy, or the President of the Board of Education. Did the Government intend that Bills imposing a charge in a clause printed in italics should be sent upstairs, or did they not? Certain of such Bills, no doubt, should go upstairs, but the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education, had instanced a Factory Bill, involving the appointment of additional inspectors, and creating a charge for that purpose, and had said that such a Bill ought to be sent upstairs. Was it the intention of the Government that such a Bill should go upstairs? He quite agreed that such a Bill might go upstairs, but he did not agree that every such Bill should go up automatically. That was, however, a very simple illustration of a Bill involving a small charge of which the House would not take much notice. But the Army Bill involved a charge of £2,000,000. If that had a clause in italics to say that funds should be paid to the county associations throughout the country it surely was not a Bill that should go upstairs automatically. That Bill ought to be referred only after full discussion as to whether it should be referred upstairs or not. In the case of all such Bills the procedure in the future ought to be the same as at present. A Motion ought to be made, and the House ought to be allowed to discuss it before dividing on it. That was the case raised by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education. But when that case had been swept out of the way larger cases of real financial responsibility were involved, and those ought to be retained for the consideration of the House. The financial control of the House, to be effective, must be exerted before the expenditure developed, and not when the money had been spent, and the time had come to pay. It was the habit of the House to reserve its aspirations for economy until the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in his Budget, but it was impossible to cut down expenditure when the Chancellor of the Exchequer was asking for the money. If the House wished to control expenditure they must exercise their control the moment the tax was proposed. Supposing the Government introduced a measure to provide that certain sums should issue from the Consolidated Fund for certain Irish purposes, and that Bill was referred to a Committee of eighty Members, in which, owing to there being a special Committee sitting which the Scottish Members were attending, the great majority of the Members were English; if that Committee preferred to charge those sums to Irish funds, it would be impossible, when that Bill came back on report, to reverse that decision. The right hon. Gentleman said the Bill might be recommitted. Certainly. But that was one of the inconveniences of this attempt to withdraw effective discussion from the House, to force them in future to do constantly what had been done very rarely in the past. The Motion to recommit would become constant in future. If the majority of the House tabled a Motion to recommit, had they power to discuss the merits of the question on such a Motion? The President of the Board of Education said they could, but he did not think that was quite plain. He believed that discussion on the Motion to recommit would be kept within very narrow limits, even if they could discuss at all the merits of the proposition in respect of which they moved to recommit. If they passed the

Standing Order in the form in which it appeared, they would not only be doing what the Chancellor of the Duchy declared the Government had no desire to do and would not do, which it would be foolish and wicked of them to do, and he would vote with the Opposition against the Government if they attempted to do, but they would really seriously affect the powers of the House to deal with these matters. The Prime Minister had heard the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy, and that of the President of the Board of Education, and he appealed to him to say which of his two colleagues spoke the mind of the Government. The Chancellor of the Duchy had said that all Bills italicised would go upstairs. [AN HON MEMBER: No.] He would accept no one's contradiction on that point save that of the right hon. Gentleman himself. He asked the Prime Minister to tell them what really was the intention of the Government.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he must turn back to what the Chancellor of the Duchy had said, because it had rather an important bearing on this point. The right hon. Gentleman had dwelt considerably on the important point that every money Resolution of any sort must be adopted in Committee of the Whole House and in the subsequent stage of Report, and that in that lay the protection of the House to look after its own interests so far as financial arrangements were concerned. But it was difficult to fit in the right hon. Gentleman's speech with a very pregnant remark which he made when he was acting as Chairman of the Committee of Procedure last year. When his right hon. friend the Member for the City of London was giving his evidence and describing his attitude towards these money Resolutions the Chancellor of the Duchy, at the end of his right hon. friend's remarks, said as Chairman that it would save time if he stated that it was the intention of the Government to submit proposals on the point in the form of a Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London said it would have his hearty support. From the Chancellor of the Duchy's attitude in the Committee upstairs, and from the definite statement he made then, it was evident that the Government had in their minds proposals to abolish these stages upon money Resolutions, and to take away from the House the opportunity of dealing with financial matters. If those opportunities were to be taken away, and they apparently were what the Chancellor of the Duchy mostly relied upon, he thought they ought to be advised where the opportunity for discussion in the House would occur in any way whatever in regard to Bills which imposed charges. He would like to have a statement in reference to that from the Prime Minister, because he thought they ought to be authoritatively advised, when a member of the Government relied on those stages which would afford the House an opportunity of discussing these financial matters, and at the same time told them that the Government intended to abolish those stages. The Minister for Education had laid great stress on the opportunities given by the Estimates. The charges made in a Bill were not provided for by the Estimates until the next year, or at the very earliest by the Supplementary Estimates. Therefore the money clauses of a Bill could never be really considered in many cases until practically a year after the legislation, had come into operation. That, therefore, was a perfectly illusory argument to put forward; it was one which must be put aside altogether. It was proposed to have a Scottish Grand Committee and, as they understood, the same thing for Wales, and surely they ought to consider very carefully how they parted with their control over money matters, when it was proposed to give extended powers to different parts of the country. When they were dealing with an entirely new condition of things the House ought to be jealous of one of its earliest constitutional privileges, and to keep control over money matters, especially as the Government themselves intended, apparently, to take from them some of their most ancient rights, in regard to financial subjects.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) was understood to say that the argument of the President of the Board of Education was wholly illusory, and he would be borne out by Members of the House when he stated that the tendency of recent decisions from the Chair had been very greatly to restrict discussion of details on an enabling Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman had said that they could have a discussion on the Estimates, but, as his hon. friend had shown, that was a great deal too late. When they reached that late stage they would have arrived at the other side of a vicious circle, because they would be told that Parliament had already authorised the expenditure, and to say then that it should not be met would really be stultifying the previous decision of the House. He agreed that there might be some philanthropic Bills, Factory Bills and others—even philanthropy had its expensive side—which were perhaps not quite appropriate to be retained down stairs as regarded all their provisions. Therefore, what they were really anxious for was not only that there should be some provision by which the enabling Resolution should be discussed downstairs, but also that they should have full opportunity of criticising and of submitting verbal Amendments to the actual money clauses inserted in the Bill. In regard to the opportunity afforded for discussion on the Estimates, he might point out that some of the charges were upon the Consolidated Fund, and did not come upon the Estimates at all. In view of the illusory character of the security relied on, and knowing that some of them were willing to compromise on the matter, he wished to know how the Government viewed the proposal that the money clauses should be kept downstairs, while the other part of the Bill, which did not propose charges on public funds, should be discussed upstairs.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said an appeal had been made to him by right hon. Gentlemen opposite to settle matters between his two colleagues, and to act as a sort of umpire between them. He had interjected across the Table a remark correcting the right hon. Gentleman's knowledge of Scripture, suggesting that he would find Solomon a better character to refer to than Aaron. How he came to bring in Aaron he could not imagine. Aaron was the right-hand man and was not the man in the centre on the occasion referred to. But, from his administrative experience, he had the greatest admiration for Solomon, because he regarded him as the great inventor of the principle of method which was the most useful that he knew of in matters of administration, the method known as "splitting the difference." He had hardly ever known of a dispute between two parties on some question of public policy which was incapable of being solved by that noble and traditional procedure. But speaking seriously, he unfortunately did not observe any difference between his two colleagues. They might have been looking at two sides of the shield, but the shield was the same. What was it they had been talking about all this time? There was no difference of opinion among them as to maintaining in future the functions and responsibilities of the House on all matters of finance. At all events they did not wish to lessen the control of the House over all the burdens of the people and questions which affected the finances of the country. Accordingly, in order to keep the full control of the Committee of the Whole House over everything that was really of importance in that connection, they exempted Bills imposing taxation, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills. Everyone would admit that that was nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of the financial business which came before the House. Occasionally, it was said, there was a Bill involving expenditure, perhaps on the appointment of an additional factory inspector. But was that any reason for keeping back a Bill which could best be discussed in detail upstairs? Was that any reason why a great health Bill or a Bill dealing with factories, containing perhaps a hundred or more clauses, should be kept back when they believed—and this was the assumption they were proceeding upon—that the work of dealing with those matters would be better done in a Committee upstairs than in the House itself? Because of one little clause was the whole of this policy and the machinery and restrictions set up for the protection of public health to be vitiated and the people deprived of this advantage? He could not imagine anything more absurd than that suggestion; it would be carrying pedantry to an extreme. He quite admitted that there might be money clauses in Bills of a more important type. He did not wish to commit his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War; but if the clause in his Bill involved anything like the number of millions which had been suggested by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, then he was unquestionably of the opinion that it ought to be dealt with in Committee of this House. [AN HON. MEMBER: The whole Bill?] No. Why the whole Bill? Why should the whole Bill be discussed in Committee because of one clause? If it was important and if it was thought desirable that some clause involving a real and substantial draft upon the public resources should be kept in the House, they had provided the means of doing that in the latter part of the rule, which said that the House might on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and commit it to the Committee of the Whole House in respect of other of its provisions. He was greatly shocked and distressed to hear the hon. Member who moved the Amendment casting discredit upon the Committee of Selection by implying that it was, or might be, partisan in its action. One of the chief matters on which they had to congratulate themselves was the implicit confidence which the House had always deservedly displayed in that Committee and the Committee on Standing Orders, whose members set aside their Party feeling in the way in which at the beginning of the proceedings of the House they prayed to be enabled to do. He regretted the language the hon. Member had used and the implication he had made. The very thing which the hon. Member considered so dreadful might happen any day under the present rule. A Bill might go up to one of the Standing Committees and there was nothing to prevent the very thing complained of happening, and this Rule did not increase the disability under which the House rested. As his right hon. friend had already pointed out, they could move to recommit a Bill with respect to any particular clause. The case put forward appeared to him to be perfectly imaginary, and the whole situation was met by the proposal that the House should have the power to determine which part of a Bill should go upstairs and which should remain in the House. They were all of the same mind in regard to the necessity of retaining the control of the House over financial matters, and he believed that was secured by the Rule proposed. Therefore as the Government thought the words were unnecessary they opposed the Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said his remarks had no reference whatever to the Committee of Selection. What he had deprecated was the reference in the new Standing Order, for the first time, to "the balance of parties."

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said the kind of Bill they had in their minds was not one which appointed an additional inspector, but a Bill like the Local Government Act of 1888, which entirely reversed the whole system of local taxation. Surely the Prime Minister would not deny that the consideration of such measures from beginning to end should be confined to the House. The Prime Minister had pointed to subsection (2) of the Standing Order as sufficient for the purpose. The remedy which the right hon. Gentleman applied was grossly illusory. The Prime Minister had admitted that proposals such as had been suggested might be found in the Bills for which private Members were responsible. Under the present arrangement such a Bill could not go to one of the Grand Committees unless a Motion was made, but now the reverse would become the practice, and a Bill would go to a Grand Committee unless a Motion to the contrary was made. A grievance existed, the Prime Minister had admitted it, and would lead them to believe that it would be remedied by sub-section (2). Who was to judge whether Bills were of sufficient importance to be retained in Committee of the Whole House? Was the programme of the present Government so advanced that they were in a position to say impartially what Bills should be retained in Committee of the Whole House? The importance of Bills ought not to be judged by the hundreds, or thousands, or millions they involved. They might involve considerable changes apart from the amount of money. The Prime Minister had admitted that in many cases there would be justification for keeping Bills in Committee of the Whole House. It was, therefore, incumbent on the Government to make the rule operative in the way they said they meant it to apply. It surely could not be beyond their power to give effect to what they had said was their intention. It was obvious that he and his hon. friends must continue their opposition to a proposal which would remove from the House entire control of some of their most important business.

MR. DALZIEL understood that the claim of the Opposition was that the House should give up none of its authority and power with regard to financial matters. He thought that was a reasonable claim which it was right to press. He understood that the Government fully accepted that view of the position, and that they desired the House to retain the full control which it had at the present time. That also was a position capable of being understood. The point was, how were they to deal with clauses in italics where charges were involved? The machinery was apt to get complicated unless they dealt with a matter at the commencement of the operation. If a Bill went upstairs the question of recommittal would be difficult. In order to carry out what he understood was the intention of the Government he moved, as an Amendment to the Amendment, to insert after the word "or" the words "clauses of."

MR. MOND (Chester) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the first word 'or,' to insert the words 'clauses of.'"—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) did not think that any procedure which merely kept certain clauses of a Bill in the House would really meet the difficulty. He confessed that he was a little of a sceptic on the whole subject, because he regarded the control of the House of Commons as to a great extent disappearing owing to the rapidly increasing power of the Executive. One thing quite certain was that the control of the House of Commons depended for its effect upon its control over the authorisation of expenditure and not over taxation. When expenditure was incurred the debt was authorised. What would be thought of the statement that a manager of a business was not to be entitled to give the orders of that business, but that he was to be entitled to review the payments and draw the cheques when the payments became due? Taxing was merely the payment of the cheques. The whole liability had been already incurred; it was merely a question as to how it was to be met. When they talked of reserving for the House in Committee the taxation clauses and not the Bill authorising expenditure there was some confusion of thought. If they preserved the control of the House of Commons at all they must preserve control over those Bills which authorised the expenditure. He did not think the suggestion of the Prime Minister would really deal with the matter at all. If there was in a Bill one clause dealing in so many words with the actual charge which was to be expected, that was to be retained for Committee of the Whole House, whereas the whole machinery which brought that charge into being was to be sent upstairs to be dealt with by a Standing Committee. The thing was an absurdity. If they were to retain control over expenditure, they must retain the whole Bill, and a device to divide the Bill into fragments was really not worthy of the consideration of the House.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said that it was not often that he agreed with the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, but he regretted the character of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not press it, because he believed that it would entirely vitiate the proposals of the Procedure Committee, and make the condition of affairs very much worse than at present. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had evidently forgotten, when speaking of the effect of this proposal on private Bills, that the custom was to send such Bills upstairs whether they contained a financial clause or not. The effect of the Amendment would be that every financial clause of every public or private Bill would require to be considered by Committee of the Whole House. He put it to the House whether that was a reasonable proposal. It was quite refreshing to hear hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House arguing for the full financial control of the House of Commons when they remembered the system adopted in the last Parliament. If the Amendment were passed it would make public business practically impossible, because there were many Bills with a financial clause which did not really involve a new charge. He did not believe that even the Army Bill involved a new charge; it merely proposed to dispose of the money voted in the Estimates in a new direction. It did not increase the charge but reduced it.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) did not think that the Amendment to the Amendment was at all practicable. For instance, the Education Bill of last year had one small clause authorising the spending of a million of money. Would it have been practicable to have kept that clause in Committee of the Whole House and sent the rest of the Bill upstairs? On the other hand the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that an Old Age Pensions Bill to provide a pension of 5s. per week to every man on reaching sixty-five years of age would involve a charge of £35,000,000 a year. Such a measure as that should be considered by Committee of the Whole House. What his hon. friend meant by his Amendment was that Bills containing a handsome charge against the public funds should be kept in the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not quite agree with what had fallen from his hon. friend behind him. He would prefer the Amendment as originally proposed, but he certainly thought that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy Burghs was better than nothing. He did not quite agree that it would be unworkable or impracticable. In discussing the financial clause of a Bill reference must be made to other portions of the Bill; but the House would not amend the other clauses of the Bill which embodied the general policy of the measure. That would be the work of the Committee upstairs. The Committee of the Whole House would only amend the financial clause or clauses of the Bill. He thought that the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education also took that view. Although he would have preferred the wider, clearer, and more consistent words which his hon. friend moved at the beginning of the sitting, he hoped that if the Government would not adopt what he considered the best course, they would take the second best course. He was prepared to support the Government if they accepted the concession proposed by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy.

MR. MCKENNA regretted that the Government could not accept the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman. In a great majority of Bills like Factory Bills and Local Government Bills which involved a charge, the charge was a mere incident. Under the procedure proposed by his hon. friend they would have in every case to divide such Bills into two parts—practically the whole Bill being sent upstairs, while some insignificant clause was kept for consideration in Committee of the Whole House. With what result? That particular clause would have to be put down for discussion early in the sitting.

MR. DALZIEL said that it would not take up any time if it was a very small matter.

MR. MCKENNA thought that his hon. friend's experience when he sat on the other side of the House must have shown him that a great deal of time might be occupied in Committee of the Whole House in discussing a minor part of a Bill. That would be a wholly unnecessary procedure. There were cases, of course, in which the charge on the public funds was a material part of the Bill, and in such cases the control of the House ought to be retained. The Prime Minister had admitted that it ought to be retained, and that could be done under the second part of the rule on the Motion of a member of the Government. Something should be left to the discretion of the Government of the day, who would most certainly be punished if that discretion were not exercised wisely and in accordance with the general feeling of the House. No Government would insist on sending upstairs a Bill which contained a clause that should be discussed in Committee of the Whole House, because time would be wasted in discussing it on the Report stage. He submitted, however, that the proper authority to decide whether a Bill should be divided should be the Minister in charge.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the reply of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to him to be not merely unsatisfactory and inconclusive, but to contain elements which were self-destructive. The right hon. Gentleman had said that after all the House must be content to trust the Minister who was in charge of the Bill as to whether or not it should be sent upstairs, and that no Minister would be so foolish as to send a Bill upstairs when there was anything like a general feeling that it should be retained for consideration in the House. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman meant by "general feeling." It might mean the feeling of those who by their vote would support a proposal to retain the measure, or it might mean a general feeling in each quarter of the House. The right hon. Gentleman was now speaking from the Treasury Bench, but it was not so long ago since he sat in Opposition, and if such an appeal for confidence in the Minister had been made to him then, he would have rejected it with scorn and an expression of surprise that the late Government should have asked for it. But this Resolution did not apply merely to Bills in charge of Ministers, but to those brought forward by private Members. Even if they were prepared to delegate this great responsibility to His Majesty's Ministers, who naturally from their position would be more cautious than private Members, there was no reason why they should be ready to confer the same power upon the latter. [AN HON. MEMBER: But Bills go upstairs now.] No doubt that was the case, but they did not go up automatically. The hon. Member did not seem to have read the proposed rule; it was entirely different from that now prevailing. The different arguments used by the right hon. Gentleman were absurd and contradictory, and, for himself, he thought that the Committee stage of all Bills imposing charges or the portions of them dealing with money should be retained in the House.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the President of the Board of Education seemed to think it impracticable to send a Bill upstairs and to retain the money clauses in the House, but evidently he had forgotten the second portion of the Motion which contemplated that a Bill might be committed to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions and to Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. The object they had in view was, that the parts which should be kept for consideration in Committee of the Whole House should be the money clauses. If it was possible and practicable to send a portion of the clauses upstairs and to keep a portion downstairs, why should they not send upstairs the portions which were not financial and keep exclusively for the consideration of the House those portions which were financial? It appeared to him that they ought to pause before they parted with one of the last remains of the rights of the House to prevent burdens being placed upon the people without the fullest and amplest opportunities for criticism and discussion. He could understand that his original Amendment not to send upstairs a Bill containing a small financial clause might be open to objection, but they had had a suggestion made from the other side which he confessed struck him as a reasonable one, that the money clauses of a Bill should be dealt with in the House. It was, however, perfectly hopeless to ask the Government to accept the whole Amendment, but they might accept it with the Amendment proposed. When one could not get a whole loaf one was prepared to accept half.

MR. DALZIEL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment as the Government had refused to make the small concession it involved. He thought they were making a mistake, and would save time by accepting it, but he would not press it.

Leave to withdraw being refused,

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 78 ; Noes, 314. (Division List No. 105.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Keswick, William
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Watson Rutherford and Sir William Bull.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,R'mf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,CHSussex,E.(Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies,David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt.Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry

Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G.(Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert,Colonel Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold(Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson,J.H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord R. CECIL said he proposed to move to add at the end of the Amendment "provided that such a Bill may be committed to a Standing Committee by Motion made." That would preserve the existing state of things with reference to particular Bills.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 313; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 106.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Som'rset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H. (Essex,Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E. Martin (Wals'l
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea,HughCecil (St.Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever,W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs

Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A H (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York., E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York., W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon Lionel Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York., E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 79; Noes, 314. (Division List No. 107.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A.J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J.A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson,
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Watson Rutherford and Viscount Helmsley.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth.R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,NE.)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Colonel Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. Nuneaton

Jones,SirD. Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever,W.H.(Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)

Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea. Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond,John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.M'nm'th)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thompson,J.W.H.(SomersetE)
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Verney, F. W.
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)

Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY moved an Amendment with the object of exempting from the proposed rule "Bills relating to Parliamentary reform or franchise." He did not see how the Government could seriously object to that proposal, because such measures would always be of that character which all the members of the Government who had spoken on the subject had said they desired to exclude from the Rule. They were of such vital importance that he thought it was desirable that they should be removed from the region of doubt, and therefore he suggested that all Bills connected with the franchise and Parliamentary reform should be considered by a Committee of the Whole House. It had always been the custom that after a Reform Bill had become law the Government which had passed it came to an end. A measure which involved the destruction of the Parliament which passed it was one which should not be sent to a small Committee. Every hon. Member had a right to take part in the deliberations upon a measure which was practically altering the constitution of the House of Commons. Surely it was highly desirable that there should be no doubt upon those points. Let them take, for example, a Bill connected with woman suffrage. It would be impossible in the case of such a measure for the Committee of Selection to find a Grand Committee which would give satisfaction to the House. It was not possible that a Committee of some sixty Members could form an adequately representative body to consider measures of that character, especially when they remembered the far-reaching results which must follow from very slight Amendments made in Committee. A very small Amendment in a Woman Suffrage Bill might extend the franchise to the whole of the women in the country. He thought they could justly contend that it was the right of every hon. Member to take part in all discussions which dealt with any alteration in the constitution of the House. Then there was the question of redistribution. Was it reasonable to argue that any measure redistributing seats could be properly considered in a Committee upstairs? Each constituency upon such a question had a right to be heard, and it would be impossible to have their interests properly represented upon a Committee upstairs. He did not suppose for a moment that the Government would ever have suggested that the Plural Voting Bill of last session should be sent to a Grand Committee. It was self-evident that Bills of that nature clearly came within the category of those measures which every Member of the Government had said ought to be excluded. Therefore it was necessary that such Bills should be included in the schedule which the Government had put forward for exemption. The Government had introduced a schedule to exclude money Bills and Provisional Orders, and this Amendment only added one more class to the list. He trusted that his Amendment would be accepted, and a long debate avoided.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) seconded. It was often said that Bills should be sent upstairs in order that they might receive expert treatment, and because they could there be better scrutinised than by a Committee of the Whole House. As regarded Redistribution Bills that argument did not hold good, because before such Bills could be brought in a Commission had to be appointed to take evidence as to population, areas, and other matters, in order to assist the Government in framing their Bill. Therefore all the necessary expert evidence would have been obtained before the introduction of the Bill and there could be no necessity for such Bills going to a Committee upstairs. In the case of a Franchise Bill or a Redistribution Bill every hon. Member ought to have an opportunity of speaking, because changes in the franchise affected every elector. Let them imagine he feelings of the hon. Member for Kilkenny, whose constituency contained about 1,500 electors, if it was proposed that his constituency should be disfranchised without his being allowed to have a say in the matter. What would be the feelings of the hon. Member for Romford, which constituency had 45,000 electors, if he was not allowed to appear before the Committee upstairs and defend the rights and claims of his constituency. He cordially supported the Amendment because such Bills if they were not discussed in Committee of the Whole House would not be properly considered or the interests of the electors of the United Kingdom properly looked after.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words '(c) Bills relating to Parliamentary reform or franchise.' "—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy*).

Question proposed, "That those words be their inserted."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he was sure the hon. Member would expect the announcement that the Government were not able to accept this Amendment or any other similar proposal on the Paper to exempt certain Bills from the operation of the Rule. They could not be accepted, because they would have the effect of taking away the discretion which the House possessed in the conduct of its business, and would narrow the scope of operation of the Rules. The Government were proposing these changes because they conscientiously believed they would effect a great improvement in the proceedings of the House and expedite legislative business. They ought not to shut out such questions as Parliamentary Reform, Bills which aroused strong political controversy or excited acute religious susceptibilities; Bills modifying or taking away any of the powers of the Crown or either House of Parliament; Bills dealing with the organisation of the Army or Reserve Forces, or with the Navy; Bills relating to the maintenance, organisation, or discipline of the Navy or naval service; Bills to create a subordinate Legislature in any part of the United Kingdom; Bills to ratify treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements; Bills to sanction the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown, and other matters; these were measures which ought to be left to the judgment of the House to decide. The Rule as proposed left the House to judge at the time whether a Bill should be reserved for consideration in Committee of the Whole House. While the Government must resist all Amendments of this character, there was one point upon which he was willing to meet hon. Members opposite, and that was in the matter of giving additional breadth and freedom to the discussions on the Report stage of a Bill which had not been considered in Committee of the Whole House. There was an Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University which said—

"Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House."

That would give the House in the case of a Bill considered upstairs the power to discuss it as if they were in Committee. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the other day with great force that it would greatly hamper the proper discussion of Bills which had not been considered in Committee of the Whole House, if the Members in charge of them, and other Members interested in them, had not an opportunity of speaking more than once. He did not believe if this concession were made that it would greatly increase the opportunities for misapplying time, but even if it did it would enlarge the powers of the House on the Report stage, so that, if something was lost on the Committee stage, it would be regained on the Report stage. Its terms might be improved, but the Government were perfectly willing to accept the spirit of the Amendment. Therefore, he did not think there should be so such apprehension as seemed to prevail that the Government wished to impose undue restriction on the powers of the House itself. There would be thorough investigation of the details of a Bill upstairs, and hen when it came down on the Report stage there would be opportunity for discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, while this was an improvement of the original plan, yet it but increased the objection he had always felt to the general scheme, namely, that it would tend to increase the enormous burden which the rest of the Rules would throw upon the Report stage. It was evident that the Report stage would become the Committee stage, with the double disadvantage, that on Report they would not be able to discuss money matters, and on Report the Government would not have a *locus pœnitentiœ* or opportunity for carrying into effect the Amendments which in substance the arguments of the House had induced them to accept. It must conduce to hasty and bad drafting of measures. In future the traditional practice of the House by which the Committee work was done with the Chairman in the Chair would go by the board, and henceforth Mr. Speaker would have the whole burden thrown on his shoulders, not merely of supervising the Second Reading debates and all Resolutions, but, in fact, the whole of the Committee work as well. He thought that was to be regretted from the point of view of the Chair. As to the Amendment now before the House, what did the Prime Minister say? He said that the Amendment, and all the Amendments that followed it, were to be rejected because they interfered with the discretion of the House. The discretion of the House would be far better carried out if this Amendment were accepted thanif the Prime Minister's plan were adhered to. The right hon. Gentleman had said it would be in the power of the House if it liked to keep all these measures downstairs, because any one could move a Motion to that effect and it could be divided upon. The question whether a Bill was to be retained or sent upstairs would be settled by the whips of the Party in power, and it was natural that it should be so. He was the last man to quarrel with Party discipline. There was to be no argument on the Motion; the rule was so framed that argument would be precluded, and if the Government wanted a Bill to go upstairs, upstairs it would go. Might he ask the Government seriously what their objection was to the Amendment now before the House? The Prime Minister had stated that they might multiply indefinitely the subjects which were not to be sent to Committees upstairs. Of course, it was the tendency of the critics of a Bill to multiply objections, and he quite granted that that might be carried to excess. But surely it was eminently reasonable that the House should be asked to except from the scope of the Rule matters which touched the Constitution of the country. Surely they might except from the operation of the Rule changes affecting the Crown and the constitution of the House. He could understand the Government saying that some of the Amendments of which notice had been given were so wide in their scope as to include Bills which ought to be sent upstairs, but even the Prime Minister and his colleagues would admit that a Franchise Bill was not one which should be sent upstairs. If they were all agreed upon that, why could they not embody it in the Resolution? The right hon. Gentleman had said that no Government would think of sending a Bill of that kind upstairs, because it would be such a violent reversal of the old practice, and that they might trust any Government to abstain from such a course. Let it be remembered that the intentions with which Governments brought forward Rules, when they did not embody those intentions in the Rules themselves, were very apt to be forgotten, and if they were remembered, they were very apt to be deliberately violated. Mr. Gladstone said that no Bills which excited violent religious controversy were ever to be sent to the Grand Committees. But they all knew that, though those were the intentions animating the Prime Minister of the day when the Grand Committees were instituted, subsequent Prime Ministers had departed from the rule—he was not quite sure that Mr. Gladstone himself did not depart from it—because they found it more convenient to send upstairs Bills which came under that rubric when they found it impossible to resist the pressure from sections of the House. Looking to the experience of the past, let them do their best to embody in the Resolution all the exceptions which they meant to make, and not trust to intentions which might in years to come be forgotten. They were not legislating only for this or the next Parliament. They were legislating for the practice of the House through many successive Parliaments. In these circumstances let them lay it down that Bills making vital changes in the constitution of the House, or in the relation of the House to the Crown, or in the relation of the House to the Colonies, should be absolutely excluded from being sent to a Committee upstairs. The Government admitted that Bills imposing charges on the Consolidated Fund, or Appropriation Bills, should not be sent upstairs. Why should the Prime Minister exempt Budget Bills and not a Franchise or a Woman Suffrage Bill? He thought an ordinary Budget was of incomparably less importance than a Franchise Bill. What comparison was there between an ordinary Budget, such as they had been accustomed to in recent years, and a Woman Franchise Bill? Why should they put down in a Standing Order one class of Bills to be within the rules, and another class not? It was part of a superstition of Parliament that the only thing of real importance was Money Bills, and that the whole function of the House was to deal with those Money Bills, and through them to have control over the Executive of the country. He did not see why they should frame Rules of Procedure for 1907 which might have been necessary in 1607. Their dangers now were not in connection with contests with the Crown over money. Their difficulties in the future would be as to the Constitution of the country, as to the great questions affecting the constitution of that House, and other matters of suchlike importance. Let them; at all events, frame their rules that such questions must be considered not merely on the Report stage, but in the Committee stage, and not stultify themselves by making exceptions which dealt with matters relevantly unimportant, while they left the most important things which a representative assembly could have under its consideration to the not very tender mercies of a Committee upstairs.

Mr. DALZIEL said he was very pleased that the Government had announced their opposition to the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite; but he had listened with some surprise, if not with alarm, to the momentous statement of the Prime Minister with regard to the Report stage of Bills which came down from the Standing Committees. He thought that if that statement were given effect to, and that any Member could speak on the Report stage as often as he liked, it would greatly damage the authority and the whole organisation of the Standing Committees.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought that it was for the convenience of the House that the Prime Minister should have made his statement at that time, and that they should take the opportunity of debating it now rather than later on. He would press upon the right hon. Gentleman the point put by his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, which was germane to the particular Amendment they were now discussing. The Prime Minister had made his case against the Amendment, not on its merits, but on the merits of other Amendments on the Paper. The fact that one might multiply Amendments of a kind was not an argument against a particular Amendment. The Prime Minister had admitted that there must be exceptions in the case of Money Bills. Let him reinforce what his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition had said as to the relative importance of a Franchise Bill such as was contemplated in the Amendment now before the House, and an ordinary Budget or Money Bill. He was inclined to think that the House was too apt to have a superstitious reverence for the cumbrous procedure of the Middle Ages.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Why did not the right hon. Gentleman say that two hours ago?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he would do away not with the stage which the Prime Minister wanted to do away with, but with another stage; and in regard to all minor Bills make no exceptions. He thought that their financial procedure was cumbrous, and he would remind the House that while any provision of the Finance Bill could be repealed in the year following its enactment if the Government were dissatisfied with it, they could not recede from any step taken on a measure dealing with Parliamentary reform or the franchise. There was another point on finance procedure. A Finance Bill must be based on a series of Resolutions introduced in Committee of the Whole House. Those Resolutions were discussed in Committee, again on the Report of the Resolutions, again in Committee of the Bill itself, and yet again on the Report of the Bill. So that every Finance Bill had to pass through two stages more than a Franchise Bill. In those circumstances, and the Government having thought it necessary to preserve the procedure on a Finance Bill, how could they possibly say that it was unreasonable to preserve the Committee stage in regard to a matter which was of even greater importance?

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 46; Noes, 287. (Division List No. 108.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt.HnJ.A.(Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, G'v'n
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Houston, Robert Paterson
Keswick, William
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Laurence Hardy and Mr. Ashley.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacy
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)

Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncastr
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampt'n)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Ratcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Waldle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

SIR F. BANBURY moved an Amendment to exempt from the operation of the proposed new Rule Bills modifying or taking away any of the powers of the Crown or of either House of Parliament. He said that a short time ago the Prime Minister had stated that he could not accept any of the Amendments on the Paper, but he was inclined to think that the right hon. Gentleman could not have seen this Amendment when he made that statement. He could not think that any Minister, however democratic, would refer Bills dealing with the powers of the Crown or of either House of Parliament to a Grand Committee of between sixty and eighty Members. Such matters should be dealt with in Committee of the Whole House. It might be right or wrong to add to or curtail the powers of the Crown, but they should not be considered by a Committee which, roughly speaking, contained only one-tenth of the representation of the people. He did not want to go into the question of the manner of selection of these Committees, nor did he cast any reflection upon the Committee of Selection, of whom he had a high opinion. He agreed with the Prime Minister that when the Members arrived in the Committee room all Party feelings dropped; but they could not forget that one of these new Standing Orders directed the attention of the Committee to the state of Parties in connection with the selection of Committees. He believed it was the first time that in the Standing Orders the question of Party had been raised at all, or any explicit direction given on that subject to the Committee of Selection. [Mr. McKenna dissented.] Well, he spoke subject to correction. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would like to explain.

Mr. McKENNA said he would wait till he came to reply to the Amendment.

Sir F. BANBURY said the point was not a vital one, because, of course, it told both ways. The right hon. Gentleman who now represented the Government told them a short time ago that the Minister in charge of a Bill was to be the sole judge to determine what course should be pursued with regard to that Bill. It could not, however, in his judgment be tolerated that a Bill dealing with the powers of the Crown should be in the hands of one single individual, however competent.

Mr. McKENNA said that if the hon. Baronet would look at the Standing Order he would see that the question was not determined by the Minister in charge of the Bill, but by the House.

Sir F. BANBURY said that meant nothing if the Minister in charge of the Bill made a Motion on the subject.

Mr. McKENNA: No, no. The hon. Baronet has not read the Standing Order.

Sir F. BANBURY said that, supposing he were to move, as it would be in the power of any hon. Member to do, immediately after the Second Reading that a Bill should be retained in the House, there would be no debate, and it would be decided by the vote of the House acting on the views of the Government.

Mr. McKENNA said he was only objecting to the statement that he had said that the sole arbiter was the Minister in charge of the Bill.

Sir F. BANBURY said that if the right hon. Gentleman did not say that he apologised. It was a misunderstanding, but it came to exactly the same thing, because unless the Minister in charge of the Bill felt that it ought to remain in the House it went automatically upstairs, and it was absolutely futile to say that any Member on the Opposition side of the House could move to retain it, as he would have no prospect of success against the Minister in charge. If, however, the right hon. Gentleman meant to infer that Government tellers would not be put on, that really altered the situation.

Mr. McKENNA said he was only correcting the statement which the hon. Baronet made, and no inference of that nature could be drawn from his remarks.

Sir F. BANBURY replied that he could only say that the safeguard, unless the Government withdrew their tellers, would be worth nothing. He was inclined to regard the right hon. Gentleman as a partisan in this case, because he had only shown that there were safeguards—which, in his opinion, did not exist—which would enable a Bill to be retained in the House. But why run any risk? Why not make it certain that such a Bill of the sort suggested must remain in the House? Coming to the second part of the Amendment which dealt with interference with the powers of either House of Parliament, his proposal was a very important one in view of what was taking place at the present time. He was not quite so sure that the right hon. Gentleman or the Party opposite would be inclined to accept that part of the Amendment, although he thought they ought to do so, because they contended that the country was with them. How could they tell whether the country was with the Government or with anybody else who brought in such a proposal, unless they left the decision to the unfettered discretion of Parliament. If the Government brought in a Bill dealing with the powers of a particular House of Parliament and left that measure to the tender mercies of sixty, eighty, or ninety-five Members, how could they answer for it that there would be anything like a decisive expression of opinion commending itself to the feelings of the country? What would be said of such a Committee in which Members representing those who desired to preserve the existing powers would be outvoted and overwhelmed? Could such a Committee be taken as representative of the feeling of the country or of the Members of the House? This question involved the whole government of the country, and it seemed to him that, if ever there was on the part of a Government installed by fortuitous circumstances in a particular place an attempt to gerrymander the Constitution of the country by a side-wind, it was this. Because these rules were not introduced for this particular purpose, but in order to expedite business. The right hon. Gentleman would not say the alteration of the powers of another place was going to take place every session. It was a thing which would only occur once in every twenty or thirty years, or at even longer intervals. The right hon. Gentleman surely would not deny that the House had a right to consider in that time proposals which were practically as revolutionary as the attitude of Cromwell when he, with a company of what was now the Coldstream Guards, entered the House of Commons and removed the mace from the Table. He had endeavoured to show that his Amendment would not interfere with the facilitation of business; that the questions with which it dealt could only arise at long intervals; and that when such important questions did arise it was absolutely necessary that the representatives of the people should have an opportunity of discussing them fully in this Assembly. He begged to move.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham), in seconding, expressed his strong conviction that this Amendment should be accepted. He had always had the greatest admiration of the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Resolution, but he thought it would tax all his ingenuity to find any argument against the Amendment. He would probably argue that the probabilities of such Bills being brought in was very small, and that when brought in they might be dealt with by a Committee of the Whole House. The day had gone by for leaving anything to chance or luck, and it was therefore necessary to safeguard themselves from anything which was likely to injure the reputation of the House. He thought it would be calculated to injure the reputation of the House if a Bill such as either of the two mentioned by the hon. Baronet were dealt with in any other way than by a Committee of the Whole House. He failed to see what objection there could possibly be to the Amendment. It really carried out the principles of the Resolution, which were to safeguard the House against a Bill of very important character, or one the character of which required that it should be discussed in the House, being sent upstairs.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, '(c) Bills modifying or taking away any of the powers of the Crown or either House of Parliament.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Questions proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. MCKENNA said the answer to the Amendment was much simpler than the noble Lord who had just sat down imagined. It was that these Bills were not, as he thought, Bills which arose once or twice in every century. His experience in the House had been short, but it had been long enough for him to have been responsible for two such measures. Last session he introduced two Bills, both of which modified the powers of the Crown—the Crown Lands Bill and the Treasury Powers Bill. The first dealt with the powers of the Board of Agriculture, and the second measure transferred from the Treasury to the Local Government Board the sanction for loans, and also dealt with rights to the foreshore. In both cases the character of the Bills was such as obviously made them suitable to go before a Committee upstairs. Indeed, nearly all departmental Bills in some way affected the powers of the Crown, and it was generally agreed that they should go for examination before a Committee. It was inconceivable, however, that great constitutional measures would be withdrawn from discussion in the House itself. Half the trouble of these debates arose from the fact that hon. Members only started to read the proposals when they began to discuss them.

Was it conceivable that the House would allow great constitutional changes —changes as great as those effected by Cromwell when he removed the mace—to be discussed merely by a Committee upstairs? If the House was so unreasonable then indeed he could not conceive why such measures should not be discussed by reasonable men upstairs. If the House did not trust the Government they must trust themselves, and they had full power to punish any Government which should so misuse its power as to send great constitutional questions to any of these Committees. He appealed to hon. Members not to continue the discussion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the right hon. Gentleman's defence was ingenious but not conclusive. He had given as an illustration two Bills which he last session had referred to Standing Committees—the Treasury Powers Bill and the Crown Lands Bill—and had said that those Bills affected the powers of the Crown. But that was not the wording of the Amendment. The Amendment said "modify or take away." There was a substantial difference between "affecting" and "modifying or taking away." Those Bills did not modify or take away any power of the Crown. What they did was to transfer the powers from one department of the Crown to another. He thought the silence of the right hon. Gentleman showed that he had destroyed his argument. He agreed that there were little Bills of the kind which had been referred to which ought to go upstairs, and if that could be prevented by the Amendment they would be very glad to have words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman which would take them out of the category covered by the Amendment. But he did not think that they would come under its words. As to the big Bills, the right hon. Gentleman had said that all their opposition arose from the fact that they did not read the Standing Order. Though it was in the power of any Member to move that the Bill be retained in the House, that was absolutely no protection to the minority. The only protection to the minority in the House was two-fold. In the first place it was in the sense of responsibility, fair play, and what was due to the dignity of the House and of its Members possessed by the Government of the day, and especially by the Leader of the House. In the second place, if that was insufficient, it was in the opportunity of the minority to make their case before the House, and every one who had been in the House any time could recollect occasions when, if the Government had taken a division at once, they would have had a full majority, but when, after a two hours discussion, the Government had either withdrawn or modified their proposal or carried it by a remarkably reduced majority. It was not until they had a discussion in the House that they could ascertain whether or not a proposal was reasonable.

MR. McKENNA: The Motion can be made immediately after the Second Reading discussion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that was a distinct Motion, and was put without discussion. His forecast was that the result of the Standing Order would be that on a Bill with a shadow of contention about it a Motion to keep it in the House would be made by some one as a matter of course, and equally as a matter of course, and without giving the question two minutes consideration, the majority would vote that it should go upstairs. That was no protection to the minority. The safegard which the right hon. Gentleman held out to them, that they could always divide the House, was merely an opportunity for them to make a protest; it was no opportunity to make their view prevail. The only other safeguard lay in the intention or the moderation of the Government of the day. The right hon. Gentleman had repeated phrases, used by other Members of the Government, that it would be absurd and unreasonable to send to a Committee upstairs a great constitutional measure. But the Prime Minister had used an ominous phrase just now. He had said, as regarded the particular Amendment under discussion, that its object would narrow the field of the operation of these proposals. What did he mean by that? Surely, it pointed to the fact that, if not now, at some future time which he had in his mind, the scope of these proposals would be wider than possibly was contemplated by Members now listening to the discussion. But whether the Government had that in mind or not, he staked his reputation as a Parliamentary prophet that the Standing Order would be used more and more, and any quotations which might be made in the future of the intentions now expressed by Ministers would have no binding effect either upon them or upon other Ministers or the House of Commons as a whole. They would say, "No; we see the Standing Order; we look back to the Votes and Proceedings; we see that the House declined to exclude these Bills from the ordinary procedure of sending them upstairs; we see nothing inconsistent or improper in sending them upstairs." And they would send them upstairs. That suited the Party opposite for the moment; a little while ago it would have suited those on his own side of the House extremely well; some time hence it might suit them extremely well again. He made his protest against the action of the Government, but he and his friends reserved to themselves the right, when their time came, to use freely the weapons which the Government were forging.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said the right hon. Gentleman who had answered for the Government and opposed the Amendment, had tried to put them off by saying that departmental Bills under this Amendment would not be able to go upstairs, which was obviously the place for them. He had anticipated that they would have a more or less thin argument on behalf of the Government against this proposition, but he had not thought that it would bear so little investigation. It did not stand even a moment's criticism, because the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had shown very clearly that the Bills to which allusion had been made did not in any way modify or take away any power of the Crown. If he had not been able to show that, he had intended to suggest that the word "power" should be altered to the word "prerogatives," which he thought would convey the idea which his hon. friend the Member for the City of London, in moving this Amendment, set forth. After all, the Amendment was one of considerable importance. He was not alluding to the departmental Bills referred to by the right hon. Gentleman. He was alluding to the great constitutional questions which, after all, happily for us, were seldom heard of in this country, but which, when they did occur, ought to receive the consideration of the Whole House, and not be relegated to any Committee upstairs. While it was perfectly true that the Committee upstairs represented Parties in the proportion which obtained in the House, yet they knew that forty could do against 400 what four could not do against forty. There could be no doubt that if the Opposition was small in number in Committee of the Whole House, it was still weaker in Committee upstairs than would be expected from the actual proportions. He had had experience of that during the short period he had been in Parliament. In Committee on the Land Tenure Bill they were in a very small minority, although the same proportion was maintained between Parties as in the House. What was the result? They moved Amendment after Amendment; those Amendments were received with considerable contempt upstairs; but when they came down to the House, and they had with them the Leader of the Opposition, and the assistance of their friends on that side of the House, who could enforce the views which they had expressed upstairs, a good many of those Amendments were carried. That only showed the importance to the Opposition of having measures which they considered of the utmost importance discussed by the Whole House, and not relegated to a Committee upstairs, as was suggested. He did not think that the Minister for Education would have hesitated to accept this Amendment, which was obviously a sensible one, had it not been that the Prime Minister had made the rash statement the other day that the Government was not prepared to add any Bills to those already exempt from the Standing Order. He could only hope that the Prime Minister and the Government would reconsider that decision. If they put down certain Bills as exceptions to the ordinary course of procedure, he thought the lawyers would bear him out when he said that, *ipso facto*, every other Bill would be considered as not to be kept on the floor of the House. Therefore, when a private Member moved that a particular Bill should be referred to Committee of the Whole House, this Standing Order would be immediately quoted against him; it would be held that, because a particular Bill was not among the class specified as those which were to be referred to Committee of the Whole House, it was intended, when the Standing Order was passed, that it should not be so referred, but should go upstairs.

Mr T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said it was now obvious why the Government had so long delayed their threatened proceedings against the House of Lords. They had been waiting for this new process of secret Committees, where they could effect unreported revolutions. That ought to make the Opposition all the more vigilant in watching in order to see that no power was taken from the House of scrutinising carefully any of the revolutionary proposals made by friends of the Government and afterwards accepted by the Government. If the House had any sense of justice and fair play left it would accept an Amendment which would keep these vital matters under the control of the House and not allow vital questions to pass to secret Committees upstairs, where the proceedings were not reported, where the Government was sure of an overwhelming majority, and where their nefarious doings were not made known to the public.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) appealed to the Government to accept the Amendment, which would really improve their powers as a Legislative Assembly. It was of vital importance that important Bills affecting or interesting the public should be threshed out in Committee of the Whole House. What happened on the Report stage was comparatively immaterial. The question for the House to consider was whether by relegating important measures to a Committee they would turn out better or worse work. As a lawyer he had had the advantage of seeing the way in which law was made in the House last year, and he had been struck with the great advantage of the Committee stage of important measures over the Report stage. In discussions which were reported the public saw points at once which hon. Members did not see, and which even the sharpest of them had not noticed. He might mention the case of the Workmen's Compensation Bill of last year, where, on the Report stage, they had to discuss a number of very important matters afresh. They only needed to read the conundrums which were being put to legal gentlemen in the Press upon the Workmen's Compensation Bill to realise the confusion which resulted from legislating in that way. Surely, when dealing with questions upon which public criticism was useful and vital, such as the powers of the Houses of Parliament or the Crown, it was advisable that they should be discussed in Committee of the Whole House. The minority was practically powerless upstairs, and their criticisms would have little effect there, but the same criticisms might have the greatest possible effect if made in the House, where they were reported. He submitted it would be better for the House generally if more Bills were exempted from this strong and drastic proposition.

Mr. DALZIEL thought the hon. Member opposite was unnecessarily alarmed about the future, so far as the proposals of the Government were concerned. He was afraid the hon. Member could not have been present when the announcement was made that in future they were to have in the House a Committee stage on all Bills which went upstairs.

Mr. RAWLINSON asked, if that was so, was there any guarantee that every Bill of the nature they were discussing would go to a Committee upstairs and would then be dealt with by the House in Committee as well as on the Report stage?

Mr. DALZIEL said the hon. and learned Member must not ask the Government to go too far. He thought they had already killed their own scheme by accepting the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dublin University. There was no fear now that in future legislation would proceed at a more rapid rate.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not think this matter ought to be discussed now. It had better be discussed when the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman is moved.

Mr. DALZIEL said he could assure the hon. Member that there would be greater safeguards under the new Rule than there were at the present time.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said there could be no doubt that discussions on important Bills in Committee of the Whole House, being reported in the Press, had an educative effect on the knowledge, opinion, and feeling of the country. From that point of view these new procedure proposals were of a destructive character. He understood that every Bill would automatically go upstairs to Committees where reports would not be made of the discussions. The result would be that the country would not be informed of what was being done. What took place on the Committee Stage of a Bill downstairs was often extremely instructive to the Government, the Opposition, and the country. Very often even the Minister in charge did not really understand the entire purport of the clauses of his Bill until it was brought home to him in the discussion in Committee, and if they lost the effect of that discussion in Committee of the Whole House in the case of important Bills, the House and the country would lose a great deal. The gainers would be the members of the legal profession, who would have complicated questions presented to the Courts on which they would argue with abundant ingenuity and fertility of resource to their own advantage, but not to the advantage of the administrative departments of the Government. Moreover, it would be possible, under the new rules, for a measure touching the relations between the two Houses, or affecting the prerogatives of the Crown, to be carried through Committee upstairs, with the aid of the closure, without the country being informed of what had happened until the Bill returned to the House on the Report stage. He understood that the Government contemplated some concession in regard to the Report stage, allowing Members to speak more than once, but that would not be equivalent to the full discussion in Committee of the Whole House. To expedite business, it would be better to proceed on the lines of somewhat curtailing the Report stage, leaving the Committee discussion as a means of fully informing the country upon the details of a Bill.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) expressed regret at the attitude of the Government on this question. In old times, when it was the custom to send non-controversial Bills to Standing Committees, the system succeeded, but, when that custom was departed from, those Committees failed, as he was afraid they would under the conditions now proposed. There were many Bills closely affecting social life and religious sensibilities which should have all the publicity that attached to discussions in the House. Speeches of the greatest interest were made in Committee, but never reached the public. The temper in Committee was different from that in the House. There was a feeling of haste and of limitation in point of time, and, what was very important, there was little assistance from members of the legal profession. It was on the members of that profession that they must largely rely for the interpretation of the law. He ventured to say that many of the Bills which had been sent to the Standing Committees would not have become law but for the assistance given by legal gentlemen. They had had this session most interesting discussions in the Standing Committees, and he believed that the passage of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill would have been impossible without the assistance of the legal Gentlemen.

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER said he thought the hon. Baronet was speaking rather too generally on this matter. The Deceased Wife's Sister Bill had no connection with the Amendment before the House.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he felt sure that the House would act wisely in exercising the greatest caution in sending these Bills to Standing Committees.

SIR E. CARSON thought that at least the ordinary courtesies of Parliamentary life entitled the Opposition to some answer from the Government to the arguments put forward from that side of the House. He knew that the Opposition were small in number, but he did not think it was in the least necessary that the Government should be always proclaiming their contempt for minorities. Since the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education had addressed the House, the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Members had raised important matters in regard to the question now under discussion; but the only answer given from the Government Benches was the ordinary look of contempt to which they were now becoming accustomed. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] That might seem to some hon. Members a matter for joke, but he could assure them that with five years' experience as a Member of the late Government, he had never found it in the least conducive to his own happiness or to the despatch of public business in the House, to treat minorities with contempt or to refuse to answer their arguments. Personally, he did not look upon the new Rules of Procedure, and this Rule in particular, with any grave anxiety; but he saw in them a good opportunity for others more enthusiastic than himself in Parliamentary tactics, not to forward but to obstruct the business of the House. That was not a course which he himself would care to adopt. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] He did not see why hon. Gentleman should laugh. He was entitled as a Member with fourteen years experience of the House, and as one who had contributed from time to time such ability as he possessed in his profession in trying to assist the passage of good legislation, to put forward the views which he held on this occasion. It was perhaps because he was an Irishman that he could not help being amused that the Government proposed, by this new Rule, to send upstairs, without a moment's discussion, Bills affecting the Constitution of the country, the prerogatives of the Crown, and the relations between the Houses of Parliament, and yet excepted from the Rule Provisional Orders in regard to the electrical supply of a district or to drains. He thought that that really reduced the Rule to an absurdity. He believed that when the Government had passed these Rules and thereby stifled discussion in the House at a stage upon which it was most important that the House and the country should learn the real meaning of their Bills, so far from facilitating legislation Bills would be discussed upstairs day after day, not upon their merits or with the object of improving them, but because hon. Members would feel that, being deprived of the power of considering them in the House itself, they ought to do all in their power to defeat them. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] That might be an improper thing to do, but he would remind hon. Gentleman opposite that it was only two years since members of the Government were in Opposition and since the President of the Board of Education sat below the gangway on the Opposition side, and that the only reason they knew him at all at the time was that he was such an adept in obstructing Bills. Did the Government think that, because they possessed such a majority as rendered the minority almost powerless, they were going to set up some orthodox system of purity in relation to the conduct of Bills, and that they would never have to face tactics in which they themselves for many years had helped to educate the House? If they were determined to bring under their Rule such important questions as those which related to the prerogative of the Crown and to matters between the two Houses, as far as he could see their Rules would be foredoomed to absolute failure.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he never knew a more flagrant and conspicuous instance of political ingratitude than the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He had occasion earlier in the evening to address himself to the consideration of an Amendment very much on the same lines as this, and he had said that they could not accept that Amendment, or any other Amendment in the same category; but he looked on the Front Bench opposite, and, always anxious to make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness, he selected the right hon. Gentleman as the Member whom it would be most expedient to conciliate, and said that, while all other Amendments of the kind were to be rejected, his Amendment he was prepared to accept. He had always been on good personal terms with the right hon. Gentleman, for he had always thought it safer to be on good terms with him. He thought that on this occasion he had conciliated the right hon. Gentleman, but he came into the House after a short absence and found him denouncing the Government in unmeasured terms because they would not accept this Amendment. He never expected his kindness to meet with such a return. It would require a number of microscopes and a very minute examination to discover whether Bills might not in some way affect the powers of the Crown or of either House of Parliament. If exceptions were to be made, they ought to be more definite and easily ascertainable; but they were not supposed to make exceptions. The right hon. Gentleman's observations were founded on the mistake that underlay the whole attitude of the Party opposite—they thought these Rules would diminish the power of the House. He believed they would increase the power of the House. At present the House was hampered in carrying on the work of legislation, and the Government were endeavouring to expedite legislation and to make the examination of Bills which were to become law as thorough and as complete as possible. They thought that was to be done by consideration, deliberately and quietly, in Committees rather than in Committee of the Whole House. He had already said that the Government would enlarge the liberties and privileges of Members on the Report stage, to make up for the curtailment of the Committee stage, and yet the right hon. Gentleman made this terrible attack upon their scheme and anticipated evils which could not arise. They could not accept this Amendment or any other Amendment of the same kind. They were not prepared to admit any exception but that of financial Bills. The Hartington Committee on Procedure in 1886 expressed the view that every public Bill after the Second Reading, except a Bill originating in Ways and Means or confirming a Provisional Order should, unless the House otherwise ordered, be referred to a Standing Committee. The Government were now reviving that proposal. He believed it would accelerate business, and not produce any of the ill-effects which the right hon. Gentleman anticipated.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had accused his right hon. friend near him of ingratitude, because, although the right hon. Gentleman had accepted one of his right hon. friend's Amendments, the latter found something to criticise in another part of the Resolution. Whether that was a proper accusation to make he did not know, but at all events the Prime Minister could not accuse him of ingratitude, because he had made no concession to him and he might criticise this proposal without coming under the moral animadversions of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman concluded his speech by making reference to the Report of the Hartington Committee of 1886. As to that, he had two observations to make. The first was that it must be remembered that the distinguished members of the Hartington Committee had the opportunity after 1886 of carrying their proposals into effect. They all had alterations to propose in the Rules of the House, and took part in debate on the Rules of the House, but none of them revived the proposals of 1886. The list of names of the members of the Committee of 1886 included that of the Chancellor of the Duchy and those of the great bulk of Parliamentary authorities, and they carried great weight. But those authorities by their subsequent action showed that they did not believe in their own prescriptions.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: You were the Leader of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not the whole time since 1886. The right hon. Gentleman had forgotten the Government of which he was so distinguished a member, when he and Sir William Harcourt and many other distinguished members of that Committee were in the Cabinet. The second observation he had to make was that the Government were not reviving the proposals of that Committee, who suggested that the House should be divided into four Grand Committees, and that those Committees should do their work in the hours in which the House now sat. There was something to be said in favour of that proposal. The Members of the Grand Committees which the Government proposed would have an amount of work which would prevent them from doing efficiently both their work in Committee in the morning and their work in the in the House in the afternoon. Therefore for these two reasons he did not think they ought to hear anything more of the Report of the Committee of 1886. He had only one more reason to urge, and it related to the main subject of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman. What was his argument? His argument was that the House would carry out its legislative duties more efficiently if it first discussed the details of a Bill in Committee upstairs, and then dealt with them on the Report stage, which was now to be so modified as to be absolutely indistinguishable from the Committee stage except in so far that at that stage it would not be competent to discuss questions of finance. If the argument of the Prime Minister amounted to anything, it amounted to this, that the business would be better dealt with on this principle than on the present principle; that discussion upstairs would be in a calm atmosphere and that the Bill would be quietly and comfortably dealt with; and that it would be less quiet and comfortable in the House in which it was to find its final perfection. If that argument had any value at all it indicated that every Bill should go upstairs. Was that the view of the Government? It was plainly not the view of the Government, whether the view of the Government was regarded from the point of view of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman or of his Rule, because the right hon. Gentleman said that whenever there were any big financial proposals in a Bill that Bill should be kept in the House. Why should financial proposals be less efficiently dealt with in the quiet and comfortable atmosphere of a Committee upstairs? If it were a better method of dealing with legislation let it be applied to all Bills. Why was the Budget to be excepted? If anything ought to be discussed quietly and comfortably, surely it was the Budget. Why was that to be excepted? Everyone knew the reason. The real reason was that in the opinion of the Government Bills of really vital importance touching the interests of the country ought to be discussed in Committee of the Whole House. Therefore the Prime Minister's argument fell to the ground. Why was the most important business to be kept in the House if the better method of dealing with Bills was first to discuss them upstairs and then on the Report stage in the House? The more important a Bill was the more careful they should be to apply to it the most perfect instrument of legislation. The most important measures were going to be kept in the House. That was a proof that they were going to use an imperfect instrument in dealing with the great mass of legislation.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 313. (Division List No. 109.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Houston, Robert Paterson
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley GeorgeD.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm. J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancas,N.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gywnn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk,Eye
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.

Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'h
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Noes.—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Sir F. BANBURY then moved to exempt from the operation of the proposed Standing Order "Bills dealing with the organisation of the Army or Reserve Forces, or with the Navy." He did not suppose that any argument that he could adduce would persuade the Government to accept the Amendment. The Prime Minister had already told them that with the exception of an Amendment which stood in the name of his right hon. friend the Member for the University of Dublin, he did not propose to accept any Amendments. Therefore he did not think that any arguments that he might be able to adduce would be likely to move him. It could not be contended that the Army was a question which was only interesting to a part of the House, because it was undoubtedly a subject of interest not only to the whole of the House but to the whole nation. The different sections of the House held different views and opinions upon the Army. He would like for a moment to point out the position hon. Members below the Gangway would be in if his Amendment was not accepted. In the event of this Rule being carried, all questions relating to the Army would go before one of these Grand Committees, and hon. Members below the Gangway would not be able to criticise them. The Committee of Selection had to appoint either sixty or eighty Members according to the representation of Parties in the House. There were two Parties sitting opposite. It was true they were all called Liberals, but one section were Liberal Imperialists, and the other were ordinary Liberals. These Grand Committees would not be selected with the idea of considering any particular subject, but they would be constituted at the commencement of the session. If on one of those Committees there happened to be a majority of Liberal Imperialists they might on some questions join with the Members of the Opposition and the Labour Members might find themselves out-voted. It was certain that a Committee chosen to serve a variety of objects would not reflect the real opinion of the House upon such questions as Army Reform and other matters affecting the Army. He did not think it was very likely that in the near future they would have to deal with very serious questions affecting the Army, and therefore it could not be argued that the acceptance of his Amendment would interfere with the conduct of the general business of the House. His proposal would provide that any measures affecting the Army should be dealt with in Committee of the Whole House. Nobody would deny that the Army was a vital necessity to the country. What would they gain by having such questions discussed upstairs? Why should he be deprived of listening to the arguments of hon. Members below the Gangway on Army matters? He would not have any opportunity of knowing what they said upstairs, because *Hansard* would not report them. He felt sure that, after mature consideration, the right hon. Gentleman would agree that at any rate they ought to ensure that matters relating to the Army should receive proper consideration. With regard to the Navy the force of his argument was much greater. There were rarely any questions in regard to the Navy likely to occupy much time, and he hoped hon. Members would be given every opportunity of expressing their views upon naval matters which everybody regarded as the most important that could be brought before the attention of Parliament and the country. The Navy was our first line of defence and the discussion of naval matters ought not to be relegated to a comfortable and quiet Chamber upstairs, to be dealt with by some sixty or eighty Members, where the country would not know what was being done. This was a most important Amendment. It dealt with the whole safety of the country. When he remembered what took place a few years ago when the country was in a difficult position he trembled to think what might be the result if our defences were to be left to the tender mercies of sixty or seventy Members chosen, one did not really know how, deliberating in a quiet manner in a Chamber upstairs where the proceedings were unreported.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) seconded the Amendment. He said it was not proposed that there should be a Service Committee, and yet Bills dealing with military and naval affairs would be referred to one or another of the four Standing Committees, though the Committee was appointed without regard to military or naval matters. It might have no military or naval representative on it at all. On the other hand, the Committee might have a predominant military or naval representation, and no Labour or trade union representative. He did not think hon. Members below the Gangway would like to have military and naval matters settled upstairs without their having a voice in the discussion of the details. From whatever point of view they looked at it it was desirable that these matters should be dealt with by a Committee of the whole House, unless a special Service Committee was appointed. If these Procedure Rules were passed, the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill could be referred to one of the Committees, and he did not think any of the Committees was fit to deal with a Bill changing the whole of our military system. Looking a little further ahead, let them assume that the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill was a failure—he hoped it would not be—they would be face to face with the question whether they could go on with the voluntary system or not. He thought most people admitted that if the scheme failed, this country must go in for a compulsory system. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No."] Were the details of a system of conscription, or compulsory service, to be dealt with by the Standing Committee on Law, or the Standing Committee on Trade, sitting almost *in camera*—for there was no official report of the proceedings? These matters were far too important to be decided in a slipshod manner by a Committee upstairs. The same argument applied in regard to matters relating to the Navy. It was manifestly desirable that the deliberations of the House, or any part of the House, should have the greatest possible publicity, and that they should not be confined to a small body selected without any reference whatever to their ability to discuss great questions of Imperial importance.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at end, to add, (c) 'Bills dealing with the organisation of the Army or Reserve forces, or with the Navy.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said he was sorry they had had no reply vouchsafed them by the Government. He was in hearty sympathy with the Amendment, in favour of which the mover and seconder had put forward sound arguments. There were two grounds on which the Amendment ought to be accepted by the Government.

The first was that measures which dealt with questions of Imperial and National importance ought to be reserved for discussion by the Whole House. The second was that questions dealing with the maintenance of the Army and Navy, in which the electors of the country were most keenly interested, should also be reserved for consideration by the Whole House. That was forcibly brought to the attention of the House on the previous evening by the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, who told them that he had been travelling about in his constituency, and had found that his constituents took the keenest interest in the Territorial Army Bill and that he thought it was his duty, as a supporter of the Government, to tell them what was the opinion of his constituents on that measure. He was sure that all the Members on the Opposition side of the House felt most strongly that any Bills dealing with the reorganisation of the Army or Navy ought to receive the fullest discussion in the House of Commons where that discussion could be fully reported in the newspapers. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had said that the Government were entirely in agreement with the argument that the House of Commons should have complete control over expenditure; but that could only be secured by discussing the administration of the Naval and Military Forces of the country in Committee of the Whole House. The Secretary for War, in introducing his Army Bill, had told them that the efficiency of the Auxiliary Forces would by it be materially improved, and that the expense of maintaining the Militia and Volunteers would be materially reduced. He submitted that the country would be unable to understand how the efficiency of those Forces could be maintained or improved unless the subject was discussed fully in Committee of the Whole House.

Captain CRAIG (Down. E.) recognised that far-reaching changes in procedure were being proposed by the Government, and it did not require one with very long practice of the House to see that if the Rule now under discussion was carried in its entirety a large amount of the influence of private Members would be taken away. As one who had taken the deepest interest in the Army and Navy, he objected to Bills dealing with those Services being sent to a Committee upstairs. It would be a great loss to Scottish and Irish Members if they could not serve on the Committees which dealt with the affairs of their respective countries. Then, again, he looked forward with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the Territorial Forces Bill in Committee of the Whole House. The details of that scheme were being considered very carefully and cautiously, not alone by Members of the House, but by their advisers outside. They wished to assist the right hon. Gentleman in his scheme, but many of them might be prevented from bringing forward their ideas or those of the people who were assisting them, and in that case would be unable to assist the Secretary of State. No doubt the Committees were appointed fairly, but what the Secretary of State wanted was the true reflection of the feelings of the whole country. One able and energetic Member might possibly focus the aspirations and ideas of a large number of Members of the House, but he did not think that would carry so much weight as if the views of members of the different branches of the Service were heard. He could not conceive a more reasonable Amendment than that before the House, and he was convinced that if it was accepted the time of the House would in the long run be saved. If a private Member was burning with ardour to have his views expressed on some great subject in connection with the Army and Navy, the fact that the Committee had dealt with the matter would not prevent its being discussed at a greater length upon the Report stage than it would have been in Committee. If the Amendment were accepted it would tend to shorten debates in the House.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that what had happened in the last half hour sufficiently showed the necessity of some step's being taken to enable the House to deal with this matter, and to enable the Government to bring to a successful issue the scheme of procedure which they had brought before the House. He intended not the slightest discourtesy to hon. Members opposite when he said that it was idle to expect him or his friends to answer in detail each one of these Amendments. It was perfectly clear what their object was. He had said from the first and repeated again and again, and given the reasons for his decision, that the Government could not possibly accept any Amendments of this kind. That being so, it seemed to be a misuse of Parliamentary time to go on proposing them and using any arguments that might be found to support them. What the Government proposed to do was to put down to-morrow a scheme of time-limit for the further discussion of these Rules, which scheme would be moved on Monday, the eleven o'clock rule being suspended for its discussion. The timing of the scheme, the appropriation of the time of the House, would be such as to bring the whole debate on the new Rules of Procedure to a close on Tuesday night. [AN HON. MEMBER: On Monday?] No, they must get the resolution first on Monday, and put it into practice on Tuesday. He therefore begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—*(Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.)*

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said they had a new Motion before the House supported by a speech with which he, at any rate, found it impossible to agree. The Prime Minister had said that it was idle to expect that he or any of the Gentlemen who so ably assisted him could answer their Amendments in detail.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I referred to this particular series of Amendments.

MR. WYNDHAM said that if the right hon. Gentleman had not precluded him from dealing with the Amendment now before the House, and making a suggestion which even the right hon. Gentleman might at any rate have considered, he would have been in order in discussing the Amendment; but he had now to deal with the situation which the right hon. Gentleman had created by saying that it was impossible for them to expect him or any of his colleagues to deal with the Amendments in detail. Presumably that observation had some particular bearing on the Amendment before the House. The Prime Minister swept all those Amendments into one category, and called them "Amendments of that character." Might they not retort that it was impossible for them to understand the position of the Government over this Amendment? The Chancellor of the Duchy had given it as his opinion that the Bill which was in the mind of all those who supported the Amendment, namely, the Bill affecting the Territorial Forces of the country, was not a Bill which ought to go upstairs. That was the view of the Chancellor of the Duchy.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I never said that.

MR. WYNDHAM said that in that case there was a misunderstanding between them, because certainly on that side of the House it was understood that the Chancellor of the Duchy said that the Bill introduced drastic changes into the organisation of the forces of the Crown, and was bound to modify the financial control of the House in respect of the Forces of the Crown, and they understood him to mean that a Bill of that character ought not to go upstairs. That was what they understood, and it would have shortened the debate on the Amendment if they had been allowed to remain in the belief that that was the view of the Government. But they were not allowed to remain in that belief. Another Minister of Cabinet rank, the Minister for Education, once Financial Secretary, and therefore a special authority on the control of the House of Commons over finance, had spoken, and he again must have been misunderstood by them, but he had certainly left the impression on them that that was a Bill which ought to go upstairs. And then the Prime Minister, who was a man of the world as well as a Minister, and who always believed in the easy middle course, intervened. One Minister had suggested that the Bill should go upstairs, and the other Minister had suggested that it ought not to go upstairs. Between the two, the Prime Minister conveyed to their mind the idea that some of the Bill should go upstairs, and that some of it ought to be retained in the House. That being the case, was it fitting that the Prime Minister should twit and taunt them with bringing forward Amendments which the Government could not understand. The reason they had persisted with these Amendments was that they might understand the view of the Government upon what they thought was a fundamental principle of the Constitution, namely, that the House should retain control over the finance which affected the military forces of the Crown. The Prime Minister had been at the War Office, he had been an orthodox War Minister, and he had ever stipulated for the financial control of the House over the forces of the Crown; but now he came down at twenty minutes past eleven o'clock and said that he did not understand the Opposition. He was not only prepared to terminate the debate on the Amendment, but he shut out discussion upon a matter of so much importance. The sub-section at the beginning of Clause 3 was so important that he might venture to read it—

> "The Army Council shall pay to an association out of money voted by Parliament for Army services such sums as in the opinion of the Army Council are required to meet the necessary expenditure connected with the exercise and discharge by the association of its powers and duties."

That was printed in italics and would be kept in the House. But in Clause 2, which preceded that sub-section and which was to be allowed to be discussed upstairs, there were provisions for spending money for the provision and maintenance of rifle ranges, buildings, magazines, sites of camps for the Territorial Force, establishing and maintaining or fostering and encouraging cadet battalions and corps, and rifle corps, the provision of horses for the peace requirements, and other matters entailing the expenditure of hundreds and thousands of pounds. All these matters were not printed in italics. Earlier in the afternoon the Government denounced and derided an Amendment brought in by a private Member, and said it was practically impossible to discuss a clause in italics downstairs and the rest of the Bill upstairs. Here was one of the principal measures of the session, involving a high expenditure, of which, if this rule was passed, four lines in italics could be discussed as an isolated item downstairs and the rest would be discussed upstairs. The inconsistency of the Government beggared description. The right hon. Gentleman had led the House to believe that part of a Bill could be discussed downstairs and part upstairs. But when the right hon. Gentleman told them the only part to be discussed downstairs was the part in italics, and when the part in italics came after all the provisions to transfer from the House all the powers of the purse, then they had reached the point of farce, and there was no justification for the proposal the right hon. Gentleman had just made.

MR. DALZIEL appealed to the Prime Minister to provide, in his limit of time for the discussion of the Rule, some opportunity to the private members to state their views. He expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would not assume that because the two front benches were agreed, the whole of the House was agreed on the principle of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University. At present, if a private Member was early in the ballot and got his Bill through a Grand Committee he had a chance with the present Report stage of getting the Bill passed into law. But under the scheme before the House, having got his Bill through the Grand Committee, he would have to face all the dangers of what was practically a new Committee stage in the House, with the result that in the press of business at the end of the session, he would never get his Bill passed. He therefore begged the Government to give the House an opportunity of considering the Amendment, before they fixed a limit for ending the discussion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: called attention to the importance of the statement made by the Prime Minister in moving the adjournment of the debate and its effect upon the arguments with which the Government bench had hitherto met all the Amendments moved from the Opposition side of the House. It had always been objected to the Amendments moved from that side of the House either that they would exclude from the purview of the Grand Committee trivial measures which should go there, or that it was unnecessary to exclude grave matters because they might always trust to the sense of fairness of the Government of the day and to their desire that adequate discussion should be given to any great changes that might be proposed. They were discussing changes the extent of which the Government had made no attempt to minimise; in fact they prided themselves upon their magnitude. They were changes not in regard to any particular subject, but which affected their procedure in regard to every subject and every Bill. What did the sense of fairness in which they were told to put their trust lead the Government to do? It led the Prime Minister to come down to the House at half-past eleven o'clock with the announcement that he would bring forward a proposal which would stop all debate on his Resolutions the next day. That was an illustration of how little faith could be placed in any Government. He did not make that as a special charge against this Government, although he thought they had pressed their powers to an extent unknown in the history of Parliament. He did not think any hon. Member who sat in the last Parliament would deny that statement. [Cries of "Yes" and "the Member for Rushcliffe."] He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe would deny the statement he had made.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said he traversed the statement entirely.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the late Government proposed Amendments to the Rules of the House which were fought with great persistency by hon. Gentlemen opposite, including the Prime Minister. How many days were given? They had had three days on the present Rules, and they were promised one day more. The late Government gave seventeen days. As three were to seventeen so were the whips with which the late Government scourged the then Opposition to the scorpions applied by the present Government to their opponents.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We have been three days over seven lines.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked what that had to do with the matter. A skilful draftsman could put a great deal into seven lines, and especially the first seven lines. The time spent on Bills must be measured by the importance of the subject discussed. Could the time spent on the Agricultural Holdings Bill or the Plural Voting Bill of last year be measured by the number of lines in the Bills as originally introduced? Let hon Gentlemen opposite read the number of lines inserted in those Bills, not because the Government thought they were necessary in the first place, but because they were proved to be necessary the moment the questions were discussed. He would repeat his statement that the Government were using the power of their majority in a way unknown in the history of Parliament, and he would invite the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe to justify his contradiction. The right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench were going to sit on the Opposition Benches. ["When?"] Perhaps a great deal sooner than some hon. Members of the House imagined. The Government were now forging new weapons for their own purposes. He thought these changes were injurious to the House of Commons, but if the present majority insisted on making them, they would be used by their opponents when their day came. Those who were now sitting on the Ministerial Benches would then stew in the juice which they had served out to their political opponents.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 288; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 110.)

AYES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,R'mf'rd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Cobett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E.(Derbyshire,N.E
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brymor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowdon, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

And it being half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at ten minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 12th April, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bath, Handforth, Liverpool, Nantwich, Penryn, Pontardawe (rural), Sheffield, and the South Staffordshire Joint Smallpox Hospital District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns, read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 154.]

Great Central Railway Bill. Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PETITIONS.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; from Clackmannan; Edinburgh; Girvan; Johnstone and district; and, St. Andrew's and District; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Banchory; Barrhead; Benholm; Blairgowrie; Blairgowrie and Rattray; Carluke; Coenhill; Crail; Dingwall; Edinburgh; Glasgow (two); Glengarnock; Kinning Park; Largo; Larkhall; Leith; Lochmaber; Motherwell; Paisley (four); Portobello; Sanquhar; and, Southend (Argyll); to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Carlisle, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SHOPS BILL.

Petition from Paisley, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL.

Petition from Devon and Cornwall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Acorn Lodge, Cannock; Agecroft; Altham; Annesley; Atherton; Babbington; Bamfurlong; Bank Hall; Bargoed; Batonrigg; Bestwood; Bickershaw; Blainscough; Bower; Brackley; Bridgewater; Brook; Brynteg; Burnley; Carberry; Chissnall (Nos. 1 and 2); Clifton (two); Coalburn; Crooke; Cymmer Drift; Deep Pit, Rawnsley; East Cannock (two); Ellenbrook; Ellesmere; Gilfach Goch; Gilwem; Gipsy Pit; Godngraig; Grange; Gwauncaegurwen; Heath Hayes; Henllys Vale; Hewlett (No. 2 Pit); Hindley Field; Hindley Grammar Pit; Hindley Green; Hindley Hall; Hindley Trafford Pit; Hulton Park; Hulton's Deep; Leacroft; Leeswood; Linby; Littleton (two); Loanhead; Lower Ince; Maypole; Newbattle; New Cwmgorse; Newton; Niddrie; Old Hednesford; Pilkington; Platt Bridge; Polton; Rawnsley; Sandywood; Silver Hill; Smeaton; Standish; Sutton; Tingley; Tirbach; Trencherbone; Trowell Moor; Wallyford; Welsh Whittle; West Cannock (Nos. 1 and 3 and No. 1 Upcast); West Houghton (Hewlett Pit); Wigan (Ladies Lane); Wimblebury; Worsley Mesnes; and, York Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES REGULATION BILL.

Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table.

COLTON, WILLIAM GEORGE.

Petition of William George Colton, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; from Alloa; Crieff; Edinburgh; Linlithgow; Portobello; and, St. Andrew's; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (PUNJAB) (INQUIRY INTO DEATHS FROM TETANUS).

Return [presented 10th April] to be printed. [No. 106.]

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of General Abstract of Marriages, Births, and Deaths registered in England and Wales in the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3758 to 3762 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Amendments to Rules for Military Prisons and Detention Barracks [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of General Report by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie, on the Teaching of School and Personal Hygiene to Students in Training as Teachers in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th June 1906; Mr. Sinclair]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 107.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Temporary Employment of Women Telegraphists in the Post Office.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the Post Office authorities have advertised in the public press for applicants for certain positions, which, upon investigation, show that women are required to live in London and seaside towns during the summer months, and work in telegraph offices for £1 per week; whether he is aware that at the end of the summer they are to be dismissed and have to look for work at other places; whether he is aware that the wages named are far below the wages paid to women telegraphists in permanent employment; and whether, bearing in mind that casual employment at low wages intensifies the unemployment difficulty, he will discourage the practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The object of obtaining temporary assistance is simply to relieve the pressure, which cannot unfortunately be avoided in the summer months, and which is partly due to the natural increase of the work in that district and partly to the absence of a considerable portion of the staff on annual leave, which the Post Office endeavours to give, as far as possible, during the summer months. This pressure cannot be altogether met by permanent additions to the staff without great waste of force and money during the rest of the year. It is met partly by overtime; and it is my desire, as far as possible, to reduce excessive overtime and consequent pressure on the staff. The employment of temporary assistants is one of several expedients designed with that object which have been under consideration. It is only in the small country towns, where living is cheap, that wages of 20s. are offered to women telegraphists.

Leadless Glaze in Government Buildings.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the First Commissioner of Works how far the suggestions made by him to various public departments as to the desirability of using leadless glaze since 26th July last have led to satisfactory results; and how far other refreshment committees of Government offices are prepared to take action similar to that of the Home Office, Paymaster-General, Royal Mint, Royal Courts of Justice, and the General Post Office and its principal branches, such as Edinburgh, Manchester, etc.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I have ascertained that all the departments communicated with have adopted, or decided to adopt, the china and earthenware glaze established as the standard by the Office of Works. The British Museum authorities have not yet taken the same course, owing (I understand) to special difficulties connected with the supply of refreshments there being in the hands of private contractors. The departments have been furnished with all necessary information as to the articles which the Office of Works uses, and as to the prices at which they can be obtained. Arrangements have also been made with the Office of Works' contractors to supply articles to these departments, on their request, at the rates in the contracts with my office.

Education Grants and Rates in Scotland.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state the total amount obtained in the last financial year in Scotland for the purposes of education, including the Parliamentary grants and local rates, and the cost per head of the population as estimated in 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The amount expended out of Parliamentary grants for the financial year ended 31st March, 1907, was approximately £1,970,730, and the rate per head of population, as estimated in 1905, was 8s. 5¼d. The amount raised out of local rates for the year ended Whit Sunday, 1906, was approximately £1,223,760, and the rate per head was 5s. 3¼d. But, on the whole subject, I cannot do better than to refer my hon. friend to the Return relating to Education in the United Kingdom, numbered 305, and dated 2nd August, 1906, which gives full particulars for the year 1904–5.

Expenditure on Police in Scotland.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state the total amount received and expended by local authorities in Scotland on police, including grants from Local Taxation Account, and the rate per head of the population of Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The cost of police services in Scotland, part of which is defrayed from grants from the Local Taxation Account, for the year 1906, amounted to £573,348, excluding pensions, being at the rate of 2s. 5½d. per head of estimated population.

Scottish Churches Commission Awards.

Sir ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in the case of a property awarded by the Churches Commission to either of the two churches concerned, such property not being required by the church to which it has been awarded and thereupon sold by that church, the proceeds of the sale will then be subject to subsequent disposal by the Commission, or if such proceeds will fall into the funds of the denomination to which the award was made.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am advised that the point raised by the hon. Member is really a question of the legal construction of the Act, but I understand that the function of the Commission is to allocate the congregational property between the churches, and so soon as the allocation is completed the future disposal of the property is altogether outside their jurisdiction.

Expenditure on Education in England and Wales.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can state approximately the total of contributions from local authorities in England and Wales to education in the last financial year; and, having regard to the fact that £12,726,000 is stated by the Treasury to be the net amount charged on the Votes of Parliament for the Board of Education in England, can he state the total cost of education in the last financial year, and the rate per head of the population as estimated in 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Lough.*) No reliable figures are available as regards local authorities' expenditure on education in England and Wales in the financial year which ended ten days ago. It has been estimated that the total expenditure from public funds on elementary education during that period would be about £21,323,274, of which £11,022,600 would be met from Exchequer grants, and £10,300,674 from local sources, which, in some cases, may include receipts from endowments and from fees. In respect of education other than elementary the corresponding figures are estimated as £3,040,964, £1,556,488 (including sums from the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Residue Account), and £1,484,476 respectively, but these figures are not reliable, and they do not, of course, include all public expenditure upon education of all grades in England and Wales, still less the "total cost of education," which the hon. Member asks for. For this reason it is impossible to state the rate per head of the estimated population.

Population of England and Wales and Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board whether, having regard to the fact that the population of Ireland has decreased from 8,175,124 in 1841 to 4,387,887 on 30th June, 1906, he can state, for purposes of comparison, the population of England and of Wales, respectively, in 1841, and the estimated population of England and of Wales, respectively, in 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The population of England and Wales at the periods referred to were as follows:—

Enumerated at the Census of 1841.

	Persons.
England - - - -	14,997,427
Wales - - - - -	911,705
Persons travelling on railways and canals not apportioned to counties - - -	5,016
	15,914,148

Estimated to the middle of 1906.

England - - - -	32,715,922
Wales - - - - -	1,831,094
	34,547,016

Expenditure by Boards of Agriculture in England and Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the official statement that the aggregate amount voted by Parliament for the service of the Board of Agriculture for England and Wales for seven years from 1900–1 to 1906–7, inclusive, was £766,403, equivalent to 4·9d. per head of the population of 1901; and whether, for purposes of comparison, he can state the aggregate amount voted from all sources for the Department of Agriculture in Ireland during the same period, and the rate per head of the population of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The aggregate amount voted by Parliament for the service of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland for the seven years from 1900–1 to 1906–7, inclusive, was £1,198,502. This sum is equivalent to the amount which would be produced by an annual rate of a little over 9½d. per head of the estimated population of Ireland on 30th June, 1906, viz. 4,387,887. A comparison, however, cannot properly be drawn between this amount and the amount voted for the service of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. The amount voted to the Irish Department, as quoted, includes £185,000 which was borne on the Vote of the Department, but paid over to the Congested Districts Board. It also includes £280,581 in respect of the cost of the Royal College of Science, the Museum of Science and Art, the National Library of Ireland, the Metropolitan School of Art, the Royal Botanic Gardens, and the Geological Survey of Ireland; and it further includes £149,050, consisting of grants to schools of science and art and day secondary schools. No corresponding provisions are contained in the Vote for the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries except in respect of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. In England the moneys voted for technical education and for the Geological Survey are administered not by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries but by the Board of Education. It is also to be borne in mind that a considerable portion of the funds administered by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland is furnished not by voted moneys but by the Department's Endowment Fund, as provided by section 15 of the Act establishing the Department.

Map Reading for Soldiers.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the subject of map reading has been omitted from the soldier's examination for a first-class certificate of education owing to the delay in the issue of notes on that subject; and if so, whether the issue of these notes can be expedited.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The manual of map reading in use was considered too advanced for non-commissioned officers and men, and some time has been spent in preparing a simpler work. It was thought desirable to hold over the examination in map reading until the new book was ready. This text book is now in the press, and will be issued to all concerned at the earliest possible date.

War Office Contracts in Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEGH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state approximately the value of the contracts placed by the War Office with contractors in Ireland in the last financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is not possible to give even an approximate estimate of the value of the contracts placed with contractors in Ireland without calling for Returns from every command. In each command it would be necessary to examine each contract. I do not think that the result obtained at the cost of an enormous amount of time and labour would be of sufficient value to render it justifiable to call for the Return.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince) said that in moving the Second Reading of this Bill he was compelled to remember the fact that it had been for many years before the House. For nineteen years it had been presented as a distinct Bill for the limitation of the hours of labour in mines, coming before the House in that form in 1889, and for two years before that it took the form of the Amendment of measures which were before the House. It had, therefore, completed its twenty-first year. It had, in that sense, attained its majority, and he could only say that he wished now that the callow youth had developed into a strapping lusty man, that his fortunes had been on this occasion entrusted to abler hands than his. But there was satisfaction in knowing that, after all, the matter had never been looked upon as a purely Party question. The lines of Party division had never been sharply drawn in an acrimonious sense in the discussions in the House upon this matter, and therefore, while one's qualms might be great in having charge of the measure upon the Second Reading, yet they were certainly lessened, and the feeling of satisfaction was, if possible, increased by the fact that the measure had never been looked upon as one of a Party character. On many occasions it had passed its Second Reading, sometimes with small, sometimes with relatively large majorities, and on the last occasion the Second Reading was not challenged at all, and passed absolutely without any opposition being offered to it. There was almost entire agreement to the proposition that, provided no injury was inflicted upon the national prosperity, the coal miner, man and boy, had an overwhelming claim for a limitation of his hours of labour. What were the objections? The Mine Owners' Association of Great Britain had issued a brief on this occasion, as it had issued briefs on many other questions which had come before the House. In that brief it was stated, first of all, that if the measure were adopted there would be a diminution of output and a consequent increase of price to consumers, which it was said would seriously injure, if not cripple, many industries, and might even lead to ruin. The cry of ruin to British industry had been so often raised in that House that he thought it was losing a good deal of its potency. He did not mean to repeat the arguments that had been urged previously in the country and in the House as to the groundlessness of these alarms, but in order to prove the great and growing expansion of the coal producing industry he would put forward a few figures. He would take the years 1884 and 1906. In 1884, the output of coal was 161,000,000 tons, while in 1906 it had reached the astounding total of 251,000,000 tons, or an increase in about twenty years of nearly 57 per cent. But that was not the whole case. They had to take into account the productivity of the mines, notwithstanding the fact, which was not disputed, that many of the most easily worked mines were rapidly going out of existence. Easily worked mines and seams were rapidly disappearing, and mines were being worked at a greater depth and under very much more onerous conditions, and yet the productivity of the mines was increasing year by year. In the district with which he was specially concerned, the Liverpool and North Wales district, there had been a decrease of nearly 750 men employed in the course of the year, yet the production had risen by more than 1,500,000 tons. Thus while the people employed had fallen in numbers the tonnage had increased by more than 7½ per cent., and that in a district where the more easily worked mines were very rapidly indeed giving way. But he would take the nation as a whole. According to last year's returns the number of people employed had increased by 2¾ per cent., while the output had increased by 6¼ per cent., indeed nearly 6½ per cent. That showed that the productivity of man and boy, coupled with the enterprise of the employers in using modern science and invention and keeping pace with modern requirements, had been increased by both parties pulling together to meet existing needs. It was, however, still argued that ruin would overtake our great industries, even though they found that year after year throughout half a century the productivity of the mines had been increasing. This was not merely an ephemeral or transitory state of things. It embodied the experience of fifty years right away through. The employers carried their case a little further, and said that the increased bustle and hurry resulting from lessened hours would augment the risk and danger attendant upon mining operations and lead to a greater number of accidents. If that argument were sound it would follow that in those districts where shorter hours were worked there would be a greater percentage of danger as compared with those in which longer hours prevailed. What were the facts? In the county of Durham, where the shortest hours were worked, the accidents were in the ratio of one accident more or less serious per 63,000 tons of coal raised. In the district of Manchester and Ireland, where the longest hours were worked, the Government inspector reported that the working had reached a degree of safety which had never previously been accomplished, and the accidents were one for every 65,000 tons of coal raised, slightly in advance of the figures in regard to Durham, where the shortest hours were put in by the men. But when they came to the Swansea district, which in regard to length of hours was almost as bad as Manchester and Ireland, what were the figures? There they had a district where the hours were intolerably long, as the men worked ten, eleven and even a greater number of hours per day; there the proportion of accidents was one for every 32,500 tons of coal raised, or more than double the number of accidents in Durham where shorter hours were worked. If the long hours conduced to safety they would expect to find a greater degree of safety where long hours obtained than where shorter hours were worked. As a matter of fact, however, they found a greater ratio of accidents where the longer hours were worked. He had the honour of being on terms of friendship with the clerk and chief adviser of the Mine Owners' Association of Great Britain, Mr. T. R. Ellis, and that gentleman had pointed out that this Bill if carried would almost certainly reduce the percentage of coal got by fourteen per cent., or 32,000,000 tons. Those were terrifying figures, but when it was remembered that in last year alone the increase had been 15,000,000 tons, and that on many occasions it had been more than that, they came to the conclusion that Mr. Ellis wanted to make their flesh creep. But his flesh did not creep, and he did not think anyone else's would. Mr. Ellis, in his calculation, failed to make allowance for any increase of efficiency on the part of either work-people or employer, or for an improved attendance by the workmen resulting from the greater time they would have in which to renew their physical powers. No account was taken of the more efficient maintenance of the haulage and roadways, or of the increased output likely to result from the improvement of the human factors that were brought into the problem. All the argument of the employers was based upon the assumption that the maximum of working efficiency both of employer and of workman was attained, an assumption which the figures of half a century conclusively disproved. So far as to the objections of the employers. He would proceed to examine their admissions. Mr. Henry Bramall, a leading colliery agent and a man of great repute in the Manchester and Ireland district, speaking in regard to the pits where the longest hours of labour were worked, had pointed out that they were working at a depth in some of their mines of 1,170 or 1,200 yards, nearly three-quarters of a mile, and that the temperature was anything from 92 to 95 degrees. He had gone on to point out that some of the shafts were seven feet in diameter, and he seemed to think that the conditions appertaining to a shaft of that kind were to regulate the whole of the trade of the country. Mr. Robert Millington Knowles, the Chairman of Andrew Knowles and Company, Limited, speaking at the annual meeting two months ago, said that they had had to put down air-compressing plant to get the coal from the Pendlebury pits, where the depth was now so great that the temperature was too hot for horses to work in. It seemed that the conditions which rendered it impossible for horses to work were conditions in which it was perfectly possible and proper for human beings to labour. He did not think there could be any more scathing condemnation of the system under which mining operations had been conducted in many places than that statement by a representative of one of the firms who thought they had given such damaging evidence before the Departmental Committee. He thought the House would be inclined to pay more attention to the employers if they had ever tried to meet the case at all, but they had all along given an absolute *non possumus*, not merely to the Eight Hours Bill, but to every measure of social and industrial betterment. They had always raised this opposition and the cry that the industry would be ruined. Time after time had it been raised, but never once had the employers put forward any constructive policy. He had always honoured the Northumberland and Durham Coal Miners' Association, and he knew that the men who composed it were honest and honourable men. No doubt their opposition to this measure in the past had been founded upon weighty reasons and sincere motives, but they now knew that that position was not to continue, and that their friends in Northumberland were to stand on the side of the angels. [An HON. MEMBER: For a time.] At all events Northumberland was now with them. It might be said that there was a Departmental inquiry proceeding in regard to the matter, and that they should submit their case to it. [Hear, hear.] He heard cries of "hear, hear" from the front Opposition Bench, but in his judgment the stage of inquiry had long passed, because the evidence which was being laid before the Committee was evidence which had been known to every person acquainted with the ABC of the business for the last twenty years. Every schoolboy acquainted with coal mining matters knew that some pits were deeper than others; that some men had a little longer way to travel to the pit; that they did not all go down at once; that the distances underground varied so much that some were long and some were short, and he begged respectfully to point out that that was exactly the class of evidence which was being submitted to the Departmental Committee. It was given in a glorified form, of course, by gentlemen of repute and great commercial standing, but, as he had said, every schoolboy in coal mining knew all the facts that were being presented before the Committee. Seeing that the matter had been before the House for so many years, that it had been discussed openly, submitted to the electors and canvassed by the newspapers, it would be folly to say now that it ought to be referred to a Departmental Committee. What were the terms of reference to that Committee? They were directed to inquire into production, wages, employment, the export trade, and the effect on kindred industries, regard being had to the different conditions obtaining in different districts, as well as the probable effect of the proposed remedy on the health of miners; while if necessary the inquiry was to be extended to the case of metalliferous mines. That, surely, was a roving commission. Never did

Captain Kidd, in the course of his adventurous existence, embark on so broad a sea.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) pointed out that by the governing terms of reference the inquiry was limited to the probable economic effect of a limitation of employment to eight hours.

*MR. WALSH said that even so the inquiry might go on till the crack of doom, repeating platitudes to the end of the chapter, or collecting facts with which every one with any knowledge of the subject was already fully conversant. The attitude of the miners in regard to the inquiry reminded him of a story told of Sydney Smith. A friend imagined himself deeply in love with a young lady, and, undecided what to do, consulted the witty cleric. "My good fellow," was the reply, "you just do as you please; but, take my word for it, whatever you do you will live to regret it." Whatever the supporters of this Bill did they would live to regret it. If the miners gave evidence before the Committee they would be assisting in a vexatious and, as he believed, fatal delay. If they did not give evidence they would be told they were afraid to submit their case. But the case of the miners had been fully before the country for over twenty years. Their claim for a shorter day was based on the undoubted right of the workers to a fair share of the wealth they produced, and to a fair share of the leisure resulting from the increased productivity of their labour. If there was any section of the workers which had a prior claim to a shorter day, it was the miners who followed in the bowels of the earth an occupation that physically was most exhausting, under conditions as gloomy as it was possible for the mind of man to conceive. The advocates of a shorter working day said further, that if there was one section of miners who had a prior claim it was the youth of the mining population. For them it was absolutely necessary that they should have a shorter working day; it was absolutely necessary to give them some little brightness and hope while they were still young, if they were to develop that vigorous manhood upon which the forces of the nation rested. But the desire for mental improvement and intellectual progress was arrested if not absolutely stifled by reason of the long hours and onerous conditions under which they laboured. Millions of money were spent every year on education, but a large amount was wasted because technical and secondary education were rendered mere by-words by the conditions under which a large portion of our industrial population, and especially the miners, existed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover the other day told them that the standard of living was very often the standard of their self-esteem. No doubt it was because men would not be content with the conditions that prevailed twenty-five or thirty years ago that they had risen in their own self-esteem. It was in the hope that the House would help them in a work which could only have as its result the increasing prosperity of the country that he begged to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. E. EDWARDS (Hanley) seconded the Motion, agreeing with the mover that this was not a political question, as the measure was supported in all quarters of the House and the opposition to it was gradually vanishing. Everybody agreed that eight hours from bank to bank was quite long enough, and there could be no difficulty in proving that the nine or ten hours now worked were excessive in view of the atmospheric conditions under which miners laboured, and the dangerous nature of the occupation. Had there been anything like unity among the miners of the country the question would have been settled long ago; and once the question was disposed of the miners of north and south would be glad to shake hands. The opposition to the Bill was gradually declining. He might say it was now a question between employers and workmen, pure and simple, and he regretted that in all the negotiations that had taken place with the view of settling the problem of wages and the relationship between wages and prices the colliery owners had shown no desire to approach the miners' unions in order to discuss the question of the hours of labour. The cry had been raised that the adoption of an eight-hours day would ruin the coal industry. To that he replied that those in charge of the great mining organisations were fully alive to the needs of the country. In his judgment, there were no grounds for the statement that the proposed change would mean an enormous increase in the cost of production. He would not pin himself to a statement that there would be no increase of cost, for he believed the cost of production would be increased somewhat. It was asked why could they not get an eight hours day by trade union effort. He had the greatest admiration for the trade unions of the country, which had done much to improve the condition of the people—indeed, more than many were inclined to give them credit for. But were the trade unions, in face of the sheer and stupid opposition of the coalowners, to embark upon an effort to secure an eight hours day which would mean a strike that would put into the shade the appalling struggle of 1893? All who valued the interests of the working men of the country would go a long way to make impossible a strike of such magnitude, with all the disastrous consequences which would follow in its train. Trade unions might make the effort, but were they prepared to stand by and see repeated in tenfold intensity the events of 1893? They would rather trust to Parliament, which represented the wishes of the community, for the accomplishment of their object, than expose the interests of those for whom they spoke to the disastrous consequences of a strike. The great mass of workmen, on this question, sought to achieve their end by peaceful means, and by appeals to the reason and intelligence of the people. A strike was a clumsy method of settling such a question, and they preferred to ask the House to pass the Bill by such an overwhelming majority as would place its supporters in a better position than they could attain by means of a strike. Evidence had been given before the Departmental Committee which had inquired into the subject, and it might be accepted as true, from what they knew of the world and human nature, that a man was apt to take an exaggerated view of his own particular case. The workman had a most exaggerated view of the smallness of his wage, while the colliery manager had a most exaggerated view of the enormousness of that wage. One witness had stated that the effect of passing the measure would be to add to the cost of coal anything from between 3d. and 4d. to 2s. and 2s. 2d. per ton. But they need not be alarmed by that statement. They were not without experience on the point. When the Workmen's Compensation Bill was before the House it was urged that it would involve an increased cost of 4d. to 10d. a ton., but the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill was well advised in not accepting that statement, because experience had since shown that the extra cost was something like a penny per ton. or less. Applying their experience in regard to what it was said would cost 10d., and in reality cost only a penny, then, by the same rule, it might be accepted that what it was said would cost, say, one shilling under this Bill, would in reality cost a very small amount indeed. After all, the increase of cost caused by the Bill would be a very small matter indeed compared with the enormous increase of the value of coal which had been experienced during the last season. Still, if it were true that the institution of an eight-hours day would have the effect stated by colliery owners and managers, they would certainly pause before they went further with this Eight Hours Bill. The miners had no interest in passing any Bill which would close the collieries and throw them out of work. But the men who advocated the measure, with all the knowledge and experience they possessed, were fully satisfied that it would not have the disastrous consequences which were feared in certain quarters. He recalled the things which were said when the Act of 1872 came into operation. The owners threatened to retire from the trade, but they had remained in it long enough to make an enormous pile of money. He remembered that, in the district which he specially represented, when he was a boy the hours were eleven and twelve a day, and in those days the boys were rather worse treated than the men. The colliery owners and managers in the district to which he referred agreed to settle the question of the boys by establishing a uniform week of forty-eight hours—an eight-hours day for work in the colliery. That was done in 1872, in a district where the men worked eleven and twelve hours a day, and, as far as he knew, the arrangement had not interfered with the prosperity of the colliery owners. The predictions made as to the consequences which would attend the Bill now under discussion were very much opposed to experience, and he would rather take the facts which had been ascertained than rely on the assumption that the cost would be increased by from 2s. to 2s. 6d. per ton. During a long and arduous struggle the miners had been looking forward to the fulfilment of their hopes. No doubt their condition was better now than it was twenty or thirty years ago; still, their labour was of a description which justified their claiming that this Bill should be passed with unanimous assent. Surely, Members of the House would not defeat a measure which was capable of being supported on the highest moral grounds, and was based on considerations which were best for the welfare of the people. If they got the Bill through, the present Parliament would be long remembered by those who toiled in subterraneous gloom, amid terrible risks and hardships. The passing of such a measure, by reducing the hours of labour, would open the door to these men for technical education and all those subjects so much talked of; they would have more time for study and self-improvement; trade would become more steady and consistent than it was to-day; in many ways the men would be better off, and their life more worth living; and those now most opposed to the Bill would come to realise that it was one of the best things that Parliament had ever done.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. J. JOHNSON (Gateshead), in opposing the Bill, said he was sure the House would be pleased with the two speeches to which they had just listened, but notwithstanding the case they had put, he hoped the House would extend their indulgence to him while he stated the case so far as those whom he represented were concerned. If hon. Members who supported the Bill believed that he and others had a special pleasure in opposing it, they were very much mistaken. It was an easy thing to address the House and the rest of the community on a popular subject, but it was not so easy for the exponents of what might be regarded as the unpopular side, who perhaps were looked upon almost as cruel monsters. [Cries of "No, no; not at all."] He would not attempt again to go over the economic and humanitarian arguments. They had been so frequently dealt with in the House that it would be a waste of time to repeat them. He would address himself to one or two points of practical importance. Why did they oppose this Bill? They opposed it because, rightly or wrongly, they thought it would be detrimental to the men they represented. They would be enthusiastically glad if the forebodings they had put forward were neutralised, or if the evil effects they anticipated did not follow. He hoped, at any rate, that they would be given credit for having those apprehensions. He did not share the apprehension that they were going to ruin the coal-owners of Durham, because they could take care of themselves. He was thinking more of the men he represented. Another point which ought to appeal to his trade union friends in the House was that they opposed the Bill because a very large preponderance of the members of their association were against it, and he hoped that argument would have some weight. So long as the opinion prevailed amongst the men he represented that they were against an eight hours day he would continue to resist the Bill, and emphatically and boldly to put before the House his views, notwithstanding the fact that he would be opposing men whom he would rather not oppose. That was democratic. What would be said of him if he sat in the House and acted counter to the interests of men who had arrived at that decision after long and weary discussion? They had taken a census of the views of the men in Durham upon the question. In 1892 they were very anxious to find out what was the general trend of opinion in Durham, and a ballot was taken in that year which showed that 12,684 were for, and 28,217 against an eight hours day. Another ballot was taken in 1903, and the majority against an eight hours day on that occasion was larger than in 1892. He wished specially to indicate to the House as showing the trend of the opinion of the miners that on each occasion when a ballot was taken there was less than 13,000 out of a probable membership of between 80,000 to 85,000 voted in favour of an eight hours day. It might be said that their leaders did not advise them to vote for an Eight Hours Bill. Why? Because of the probable consequences which might arise. What struck him was the absolute indifference which seemed to be manifested towards certain consequences which would follow if this Bill were passed. It was well to be optimistic, and not to have too gloomy forebodings, but it was the province of coolheaded reasonable leaders before they took action to look around at the whole situation and find out whether a proposed course was going to benefit or injure those they represented. If any hon. Member would show him that the consequences he anticipated would not follow the adoption of the principle of this Bill, he would for ever hold his peace against it, because he had no objection whatever to the principle itself. What were the consequences they apprehended? In the first place they believed there would follow a very large dismissal of men. They all knew how serious that would be and what the consequences would be to the men and their families. They also feared that ultimately if the Bill passed 40,000 of their coal hewers would be asked to work eight instead of seven hours a day. It might be said that that would not be so, because the Bill provided for a maximum of eight hours. In this matter he was obliged to look at the natural trend and tendency of things. This was a measure for an eight hours day generally for miners, and if the men who worked above eight hours were asked to come down to eight, then they might rest assured that the men working below eight hours would be asked to work up to eight. That would at once prove a source of great mischief. Whatever might be the consequence he would never advise men to go from seven up to eight hours. The men he referred to had been working seven hours from bank to bank for many generations, and he was not likely to advise them to work eight hours. That was what largely influenced the men he represented against an eight hours day: they did not want their hours lengthened. It might be said that that was selfish, but it was only human nature, and men were apt to maintain the privileges they had rather than give them away. That was the reason they opposed the Bill. They did not object to shorter hours or to an eight hours day, and men had a right to ask for anything within reason which was calculated to benefit their condition and their wages. He desired to know how these changes were going to fit in so as to keep the hours of the men he represented as they were at present. Perhaps the House would bear with him whilst he made a few observations as to how these matters would fit in in Durham. Their present system of working was that the first shift of coal hewers went down the pit at four o'clock in the morning and came out between 10.30 and 11. The second shift commenced at 9.30 and left off about four o'clock. The boys went down at six o'clock in the morning and stayed on until four o'clock in one shift, so that the boys served two shifts of men, and worked ten hours. If this Bill were carried what would be the consequence? There were three alternatives. The first was one shift of eight hours for boys and one shift of seven hours for the men. The result would be that the boys would go down the pit two hours in the morning before they were wanted and would have to stop on one hour after the men left. The boys would remain an hour after the men left. Manifestly, that could not be consistent with the principle of an Eight Hours Bill. Let him take a more ridiculous position—two shifts of boys of eight hours, and two shifts of men of seven hours, making in the case of the men fourteen hours. That which he had already described would again happen. The men would go away at the end of their fourteen hours, each shift having worked seven hours, and would leave the boys two hours in the mine when there would be no coal to take away. Manifestly that was not a position which would be practicable in working. Everybody seemed to think that the most feasible arrangement would be to have three shifts of men of seven hours each, and two shifts of boys of eight hours each, making in the case of the boys sixteen hours. At the end of the sixteen hours those boys would leave their work, but the last shift of men would be four or five hours in the pit afterwards, at the special time when boys were most needed. Supposing that the boys came in two hours after the men, even in that case at the end of the third shift they would have the men in the mine three hours without anything to do, because the boys would have left, and there would be no boys to take away their coal. These were difficulties which the opponents of the Bill saw. It might be said that they were very ingeniously drawn up. No doubt science might do something towards a solution if the measure were thrust upon them. Necessity, which was the mother of invention, might do something to get over the difficulties. He was prepared to admit all that, but he hoped that hon. Members who supported the Bill would see the difficulties which he and his friends saw in this matter. The question had already occupied the attention of those interested in it, and a gentleman in the North had given a prize for the best essay on the subject. The essays were very interesting, but he would not go through the whole of them. The best that could be made out of the essays was that with an eight hours day working three shifts there would be a reduction in the output from 1,000 to 900 tons. He would not enter on the question of the financial loss which that would involve. The essays, however, had not solved the question, and they were still waiting for the man who could do it. When such a man appeared their opposition to the measure would terminate. Another serious matter was that in the North the miners objected very much to night shift working. It might be said that it did not make much difference seeing that the men were always working in the dark, but miners, like other people, had their social instincts, and they liked to devote their evenings to social occupations. One of the most serious things in connection with the proposed solution was that a large number of men would be forced to work on the night shift. He hoped the House would give some consideration to that matter. It would be said that his anticipations were very gloomy, and that they would not be realised. He was not going to move a Resolution against the Bill, nor would he and his friends even divide on the Second Reading. He and others had done their best to oppose the measure. On this occasion they did not intend to oppose the Second Reading. If the Bill was forced upon them, as it might be, they would do their best to try and work it, their desire being to have a common brotherhood, kindliness of disposition, and unanimity in the aspiration for the betterment of the miners. Notwithstanding their differences on this question there had been no personal feeling in the matter. They had had a common aim—to benefit the miners, a class that needed to be benefited and helped. He and his friends knew their dangers and hardships. They had gone through every gradation of miners' labour and they understood their needs. The House might be assured that neither the question of economics, nor any other question, would stand in the way of their efforts to secure the betterment of the condition of the miners, and making the position of the class to which they belonged, who had been rising gradually in the social and intellectual scale, still stronger and higher, and he hoped that ultimately in the matter of manhood and intelligence they would be able to say to others "Sires, we are your equals."

*Mr. CORY (Cornwall, St. Ives) said he cordially supported the principle of an eight hours day. He did not suppose that any Member of the House was not in favour of that principle. He would be very glad if he himself could put his work into eight hours a day. In that House they could not accomplish their work in eight hours a day. Recently they had three and a half shifts of eight hours all rolled into one in an atmosphere little better than that described by the hon. Member for Ince in a colliery in the North of England. He would not like to have imposed on him by Parliament an eight hours day if he wished to work longer, and he did not wish on the other hand to impose an eight hours day on those who did not desire it. The hon. Member who moved the Bill said that the Second Reading was passed last time without challenge. That being so, it was inexplicable to him why the Bill was introduced again. Why did they want a Second Reading again, when the House had accepted the principle, before the Report of the Departmental Committee had been received? The question of the effect which an eight hours day would have not only on the mining industry, but on the various industries which were dependent upon it, was now before a Departmental Committee, and he wanted to know their Report before they legislated on the subject. The hon. Member had said that the greatest number of accidents had taken place in the Swansea district, where the hours of labour were longer than in other districts. That did not appear to prove very much, because the hon. Member admitted that in other districts where a longer day than eight hours was in operation, though shorter hours than in the Swansea district, there had not been an undue number of accidents. It only proved that the hours in the Swansea district were too long, but it did not prove that eight hours might not prove too short and be a source of accidents. The hon. Member had also instanced a colliery where the pit was only seven feet in diameter, and where the atmosphere was such that horses were unable to work in it——

MR. WALSH said that was not what he stated.

*MR. CORY said he did not think he had misrepresented the hon. Member.

MR. WALSH said he made two statements, and he did not wish the hon. Member to confound them. What he said was that in the pit referred to the depth was 1,170 yards, the temperature about ninety-two degrees, and the diameter in the shaft seven feet. Then he stated that the conditions were such that industrial progress ought not to depend upon them.

*MR. CORY said he would be sorry to misrepresent the hon. Member. He understood the contention of the hon. Member to be that men were working in a pit where horses were unable to work. He could not see that that was an argument in favour of an eight hours day. That was a reason for altering the conditions of the particular colliery in question, but not a reason for altering the hours in the whole of the coal fields in the country. He could not see why they should impose conditions as to an eight hours day in pits where the workmen themselves did not desire it. The hon. Member had said that there was no need to appoint a Committee to inquire into the conditions of mining with respect to this question, as every babe that knew anything about mining matters knew them already; but whilst people interested in mining might know the conditions in connection with mining, Parliament and the general public were not skilled in the details, and it was for the purpose of informing Parliament and the general public that the Departmental Committee was now inquiring into the subject. Many statements had been made during the course of the debate with which he could not agree. Employers were still in the dark as to what would be the effect of an eight hours day, and if they thought that it would be disadvantageous to the trade it was hardly possible that they could approach the miners in regard to the matter as it was suggested by the hon. Member for Hanley that they should do. They would wait for the report of the Departmental Committee before making up their minds. The hon. Member for Hanley had also stated that it had been said that the trade unions themselves could bring about this change, but that the effect of that would be one of the most disastrous strikes that had ever taken place in the history of the country. He was willing to admit that that might be the case, but so far as Monmouthshire and South Wales were concerned where they had a nine hours day, or fifty-four hours per week, if this Bill were passed there must be some alteration in the lists of prices as the wages were based on a nine hours day, and that would undoubtedly lead to a general strike before fresh terms could be agreed. The hon. Member for Gateshead had referred to the question of the dismissal of men that would take place if the Bill was passed. For his part he believed it would bring about the dismissal of men not only in the counties of Durham and Northumberland, but throughout the whole of the coal districts of the country. In the event of old men being employed they would work at great strain. They would have to hurry to and from their work, they would have to hurry over their work, and would not have time to look about to see if their place were safe, nor to prepare their stall for the next day, and they all knew that when a man got old he did not care to "hustle." But if an eight hours day were established instead of a nine hours day, the probability was that employers would naturally select young, vigorous men who would put out the same amount of coal in the restricted day as had been put out in the longer day of nine hours. The hon. Member for

Gateshead had said it had been estimated that the reduction of the output might amount to 10 per cent., but that the increase in price of coal, in his belief, would, on that account, be very slight. But at times when prices had been most inflated it had been estimated that the excess of demand over supply had only been about 5 per cent., which had brought about these very high prices, and how much more then would prices increase if the supply was reduced by 10 per cent. The Memorandum to the Bill said that it was proposed by the Bill that the hours of work below ground in coal mines should be gradually reduced until they reached the limit of eight hours. He should not object to the Bill if the wording of the Memorandum was carried out in its clauses. But it was not. Under Clause 1, sub-section (2), however, the employment underground would not be anything like eight hours. An eight hours day from bank to bank would mean, probably, not much more than five or six hours actual work below ground, as from the eight hours would have to be deducted the time occupied in letting the men down and bringing them up the shaft; the time occupied by the men in going to and from the pit bottom to the face of the coal, which varied more or less in every colliery and in every seam, and in some places was a long way in; so that with the reduced output and necessarily increased cost, he did not see how it was possible to work certain pits under these conditions. Again, they could not let down or draw up all the men at one time. The time occupied in letting men down and drawing them up again at the end of the day would amount to from one and a half to two hours. How, then, could they ensure that the men who went down first were the first to come up, and without that, how was an eight hours day from bank to bank practicable? The hon. Member for Ince seemed to have changed his views on this matter, because at the Miners' Conference held in October, 1904, the report of the proceedings of which appeared in the *Wigan Examiner*, the hon. Gentleman stated that Lancashire was opposed to the eight hours day from bank to bank, and he said that the Lancashire miners would oppose it, unless the Miners' Federation insisted upon their having it. He presumed that the Miners' Federation had pressed the Lancashire miners in a very forcible way.

MR. WALSH said that the Bill had been entirely changed. It was to come into operation only after an interval of three years instead of one year.

*MR. CORY said that that did not change the Bill, the only difference it made was that it would come into operation by degrees instead of all at once. The Miners' Federation might force the Lancashire miners to change their opinion, and adopt the eight hours movement against their will; but he could hardly think that that was a sufficient reason for allowing the Miners' Federation to force the House of Commons to impose it on the whole community without sufficient thought and consideration of the subject. Of course, one of the remedies suggested was a double shift; but that system had been rejected by the men themselves, and he was not surprised at that. The men who worked by day in a stall would object to other men working at night in the same stall. Moreover, even if the men did not object to the double shift system, he questioned whether there would be a sufficient number of miners obtainable in the country to work the double shift. Again, the third eight hours would not afford enough time for repairs to be properly done in the main roads. Therefore, one of the drawbacks to an eight hours day was that it would be a danger to the men themselves. Again, it was not a question which affected only the coal owners and the coal miners, but one which affected the whole of the coal consumers of the country. For a time, he admitted, owing to the restriction of output, probably resulting in a coal famine, the change would so enhance prices as to enable the coal owners to make huge fortunes, and the colliers good wages. But, in the long run, the consumers in the country, having to pay dearer for their coal, the dependent industries would be crippled, demand would fall off, and the coal trade would lose its customers and be injured. The hon. Member for Ince had remarked that the Miners' Federation had refused to give evidence before the Departmental Committee. Why? If their case was so good as they would have the public to believe, he would have thought that they would have rushed to the Committee in the hope of converting the coal owners and the public generally to their views. On the other hand, the employers had not been afraid to put their evidence before the Committee, and in fact had asked for such a Committee of Inquiry, so as to give evidence on every point. As he had already said, he was in no way opposed to the principle of an eight hours day; but a Departmental Committee having been appointed to inquire into the economic aspects of the whole question, he contended that, as wise men, they should wait to obtain the Report of that Committee, which no doubt would contain interesting and important information. He therefore pressed upon hon. Gentlemen who had promoted this Bill that they would be well advised not to push the matter further now, but to wait patiently for the Report of the Departmental Committee.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) congratulated the hon. Members who had moved and seconded the Second Reading of the Bill on the tone of their speeches and the moderation of their attacks upon the coal owners, the way in which they had approached the subject, and their references to the Conciliation Board. That Board had done great good in connection with the consideration of wages, and he much regretted that this question could not have been dealt with by it. The Bill was read a second time on the 11th of May last year. It was read without a division, and so far as he was concerned, he was not going to vote against it now. He believed he was right in saying, however, that on that occasion it was read under the distinct understanding that full advantage would be taken of the appointment of the Departmental Committee in order to consider the details of the case, so that when the Bill came forward again the difficulties as to details would have been dealt with and provided for in the Bill. That was not the case in the Bill before the House. He would not say that hon. Gentlemen representing the miners did not come before that Committee because they did not desire to be cross-examined on some statements they had made, but he thought the reason they would not come before the Committee was that they would not face cross-examination on some of these points of detail.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said the Miners' Federation had never agreed to the appointment of that Committee, and would not go before it.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said the Departmental Committee was appointed, and, as everybody knew, in these matters all sorts of statements were made, but when people had to give evidence and had to be cross-examined as to the truth of the statements, those statements were frequently found to be only half the truth. A great many Amendments would be required to perfect the Bill. He appealed to hon. Members of the Miners Federation to attend before the Committee and give evidence as to the difficulties of the case in order that the Bill might be made effective. The Bill declared that men should not be employed for a greater length of time than that specified in this Act, and then followed nine hours, eight and a half hours, and eight hours, according to the work engaged in. How was a man to be labelled when he went down the mine? and when he was down the mine and in his place, how were they to follow that man and say it was six o'clock when he went down, it was now half-past one, and time he went up. That was an easy thing to accomplish in a workshop, but not in a mine. That was a difficulty that appealed to the employers, and hon. Members should go before the Committee and explain how it was to be got over. Coal owners were not against the Bill if they could see that it could be carried out in a proper way, but they wanted hon. Gentlemen opposite to assist them in saying how it could be carried out. The mere statement that men should not work for more than eight hours a day, without its being shown how that sugestion was to be carried out, did not help them. There were other difficulties. For instance, the coal hewers did work longer hours. The coal hewer worked nine hours a day, but after he had finished his work his coal had to be hauled away. At the end of the day the hewer had to get his coal out to the pit's mouth in order to have it credited to him. How was that going to be arranged.

for under the Bill? Undoubtedly there was a tendency to rush the work just before the close of the day, and under this Bill, if the hewer worked up to his time, there would be nobody in the mine to take out this coal. Unless the second shift was to bring out these boxes of coal they must remain in the mine till next day; the second shift could not do it, because it would take them two hours and for the other six they would not have anything to do. That was one of the difficulties which they wished hon. Members to assist the Committee in dealing with. Then there was the question of repairers—the men who repaired the roads and the brick work and did similar work in the mines. Under this Bill no man could remain in the mine more than eight hours from bank to bank. Was a bricklayer who was at work in the pit at the end of eight hours with one and a half hours work to finish to leave his work? These questions hon. Members did not answer, and yet it was their answers to these questions which would be so beneficial in assisting the House to get over the difficulties involved and make it possible to pass the Bill. There were also other questions. The hon. Member for Ince had referred to the seven-foot diameter shafts. It was a fact that a large number of mines in this country had shafts of small diameters—seven, ten, thirteen, and fifteen feet. This Bill would have the effect of closing all those small shaft mines. It was certain that all the mines that had small diameters would be closed if this Bill passed.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Or their shafts would be made larger.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said that those mines had been opened and worked for years, and it would not pay to make larger shafts, and the result would be that a considerable amount of the coal of this country would be lost through the closing down of these small diameter shaft mines. If it was agreed that we were to lose that coal well and good, but who was to bear the loss? Was it the man who had taken the mine at a head rent and had undertaken to work the mine until the coal was worked out, or was it the landlord, or who was it? He was very glad to see that neither the mover nor the seconder of this Bill had referred to the "tyrannical powers" exercised by the mine owners. It had been said in the past and even in the present that the work of the miners had been such as to impair their health, and that a miner came to the bank so fagged that he was unable to enjoy the period of leasure at his disposal when he reached home. That was a common statement in the past, and it spoke well for the coal owners that such a state of things did not exist at the present time. It was a good thing to hear that the health of the miners was not so affected. The principle of more leisure being given to the men had been accepted by this House last year and it would not be resisted now, but hon. Gentlemen should submit themselves for examination before the Departmental Committee in order to clear up the points he had drawn attention to. If they referred to the past they would see that the owners had not exercised any tyrannical powers over the men on this question, and, if they had liked, the Miners' Federation, with their immense powers, could have stopped these long hours. It was not because the men were compelled to work long hours that they did so, but because when once they were down in the pit they wished to make a good day and get as much coal as possible in order to make high wages. It was the action of the men alone and not the tyranny of the employer that was responsible for the long hours, and the allegation that it was the tyranny of the employers was hardly a fair one. The Trade Union and Miners' Federation were just as much responsible for the long hours as the mine owners. He appealed to hon. Members, therefore, to assist the Government to bring in perfect regulations and not to put the House to the inconvenience of passing an immense number of Amendments in order to make the Bill workable. Let them give the Committee the benefit of their opinion as to how an eight hours day could be provided without militating against the trade. He certainly thought, unless the conditions were proper and well regulated, the Bill would impose a great burden on the consumer. If only hon. Members would refer back to the time when coal was 14s. 6d. a ton at the pit's mouth they would find two things—first, that the effect of it was excellent as regards putting money into the miners' pockets and dividends into the pockets of the coal owners, but, secondly, that it ended in the destruction of a great deal of the trade of the country. Great industries were lost to Germany and other places. Therefore, when this question was brought forward again it was necessary to deal with the matter in a proper spirit in order to render the Bill workable and fair, not only to the miners and the mine owners, but to the trade and consumers of the country.

* SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he did not propose to make an appeal in favour of either the mine owners or the miners. He was fortunate enough to posesss the confidence of both the employers and the employed, and he proposed to speak in favour of both. He would direct the attention of the House chiefly to the point of view of the consumers. He congratulated his hon. friend the Member for Ince on the clear statement he had made and the figures which had done so much to elucidate the difficulties of this most anxious problem. There was only one remark on the valuable and interesting speech which he wished to make, and that was in respect to the action of the employers with regard to the checkweighmen in the last session of the late Parliament. The employers of labour then stated their case as they were bound and entitled to do before the House and the Standing Committee. But when the last stage was reached they entirely withdrew their opposition, and the Checkweight Act was passed with entire unanimity by the employers and the employed. He did not impugn the accuracy of the figures or doubt their lucidity, but at the same time the House ought to remember when a case of this kind was presented to them that there was at present a Committee sitting to investigate the whole of this problem. It was one thing to assist that Committee with evidence and figures, but quite another to interpret those figures. It was the function of the Committee to put an interpretation upon the figures. They had to decide how far a limited number of hours of labour would reduce the output, and what the probable reduction of hours should be. A considerable reduction of hours must lead to a proportionate reduction of output, and the output of coal in this country was a national question of the greatest gravity. It was impossible that there could be a reduction of output without an increase of cost, which meant a tax on every other industry in the country. More than that, it meant a tax on every consumer of coal from one end of the country to the other. This was essentially one of those questions which, though it was a working man's question on one side, was a question of all classes of the community on the other. He was surprised that those representing agricultural districts had not been alive to the burdens that this Bill would throw on their constituents. Another serious result of the diminution of output was that if the amount of coal produced was diminished, the amount carried would also be diminished, and labour in the transport trades would be diminished, and on the railways engaged in the traffic less labour would be employed. That was a point of view which was not unworthy of consideration in the discussion of the question. There were some who thought the mere reduction of hours would give the safety which was desired. But there was another question to be considered namely, the hardship which might be inflicted on the older men who had to get their living with less hours in which to get it. If they diminished the hours of labour they would decrease the output and in all probability diminish the earnings that a man was able to bring home with him at the end of a week of honourable and laborious toil. He hoped no misinterpretation would be placed upon his remark when he said he did not think the lot of the working miner was so hard and so severe as some thought. All those who were engaged in laborious occupations deserved and commanded the sympathy of the House, but he did not think anything was gained by hon. Members exaggerating the misfortunes and hardships of their lot. If he was not wrongly informed the working miner did not work more that nine days in a fortnight. He had every Saturday to himself; he had the opportunity of not working when he was not disposed to do so, and had in many other respects more liberty than any other class. He wished to assist these men to raise themselves in point of culture. The collier of his boyhood was a different man from the miner of his old age. The improvement that had

taken place in one generation would, he believed, continue, and he was sure the House would never cease to lend a friendly hand to the labouring man who earned his bread by his daily toil, and would at the same time exercise care and forethought in order that his calling might be made secure and his wages rendered permanent and safe.

*COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) said that no Member of the House could listen to the hon. Baronet without feeling the earnestness with which the hon. Gentleman would endeavour to improve the lot of the worker, and the carefully balanced mind he brought to bear on the argument on both sides of the case. He would, however, remind the hon. Gentleman that there was a time not very long ago when the employment of women in the work of the mines was before the House, and that at that time the hon. Baronet showed some anxiety as to whether the reform then proposed would not lead to distress in the mining districts. Everybody was liable to mistakes, and he might be excused for recalling that incident in order to point the moral that the dangers some saw in this Bill were not so great as they might appear. The hon. Member for the Everton Division appeared to be under some misapprehension as to the circumstances under which the Second Reading of the Bill was taken last year. The hon. Member was apparently under the impression that it was taken on the understanding that the Bill should proceed no further until after the Departmental Committee had reported. His recollection did not confirm that view, but rather the contrary. He had a distinct recollection that, objection having been raised both inside and outside the House against the appointment of that Committee, they refused to attend it. He had a distinct recollection of the raising by the hon. Member for South Glamorgan of the question of the appointment of the Committee on the Vote for the salary of the Home Secretary in order to emphasise the opposition of the Miners Federation to the appointment of that Committee. He thought the hon. Member for the Everton Division of Liverpool who, he was sure, had no desire or intention to mislead the House, must have been under a misapprehension. It was not his intention to add much more to the arguments which had been so admirably put forward by the mover and seconder of the Bill, but he would like to deal with one point that had been raised, viz., the age which the measure had attained. The hon. Member for the Ince Division had said that the Bill had attained its twenty-first year. What twenty-one years ago were the conditions that obtained in the Division he (Colonel Herbert) now had the honour to represent? At that time it was a simple rural neighbourhood; now it was a thickly-populated colliery district. There were collieries there twenty-one years ago, but they were of a very different character from those that existed at the present time. The workers in those collieries were dwellers in rural farm-houses, and in cottages on the breezy hillsides of the Welsh mountains. The lives of those men were very different—their conditions of life were vastly different—from those imposed upon the workers of to-day, and it was that change in their conditions of life which made it imperative to introduce legislation to deal with the hours of labour. They had examples in the House which showed that the work in the coal mines in the past certainly did not injure physical development. They had, however, to consider the effect of mining work upon the coming generation, and it was only by a measure such as the one before them that they could be assured of a continuation of that splendid physique which they had among the miners representatives in the House at the present time.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said he had listened with great interest to the remarks which had fallen from the various speakers during the debate. It was gratifying that the subject had been approached in a spirit of great moderation, because it was only by moderation that the difficulties of the question could be overcome. He was also exceedingly gratified to understand from the speeches they had heard that it was not looked upon as an absolute crime to be connected with a coal owner. Perhaps he might be allowed to give a few reasons which he considered militated against the effective operation of Bills limiting employment in mines to eight hours a day. The principal reason advanced was that it would militate against the consumer of coal by increasing the price, and secondly, that it would hamper those industries whose possibilities depended upon obtaining cheap coal. This was not a new Bill, neither was it a new idea. The matter was fully discussed last May in a debate which showed equal moderation to the debate of that day, and the question was referred to a Departmenal Committee which was still engaged in considering it. He joined in the appeal of the hon. Member for the Everton Division of Liverpool that hon. Members below the gangway who were most interested in the scheme, and were in a position to know most about the matter, should do their utmost to give their assistance to the Departmental Committee, and he hoped that those hon. Members would respond to that appeal. In view of the fact that the Departmental Committee was sitting at the present time, he thought the discussion they had had in the House that afternoon, although most interesting, was somewhat premature. It was urged in support of the Bill that such legislation as this was necessary for the protection of the health of the miners. That might have been urged thirty years ago, but he thought that the modern conditions under which the miner worked precluded such an argument. With the present system of ventilation in mines it could not fairly be urged that the work was injurious to health for those engaged in the industry; in fact, statistics proved the reverse, and showed that the percentage of illness among miners was lower than among any other section of the population in the country. Another argument in support of the Bill was that the great bulk of the mining population were in favour of the limitation of the hours of working. He thought there was a good deal of misapprehension in the minds of many people as to the amount of work which really was executed by miners, and perhaps some hon. Members would agree with him that it was trespassing upon the liberty of the individual to forbid him, by a Parliamentary measure, working more than eight hours a day if he wished to do so. Further than that, he did not see how it would be possible to carry out the regulations. Another objection to the proposal was that the scheme would result in a diminution of output. The great disadvantage of that was that if there were a serious diminution of the coal output it would paralyse many other industries which were dependent on a cheap coal supply. Further, it was the opinion of representatives of working men that the scheme, too, would injure the working classes. There was a great deal to be said on that score, because it would mean a revolution of the working man's mode of living, and a dislocation of trade. If there was any substance in those contentions, and they had never been denied, the effect of the Bill upon all concerned would be, indeed, serious. The coal mines on the west coast of England were far deeper than those on the east coast, so that if the hours were shortened to any great extent it would be impossible to obtain so much of the coal which was situated far from the mouth of the pit, and consequently the competition of the west and the east would be accentuated to a very great degree. He did not think there was any need to dilate upon the question of decreased output. A decreased output meant an increased cost of production. It was thought by some that the coal owner reaped enormous benefit, but it should be borne in mind that the margin between the cost of production and actual profit was often very small indeed. Sometimes it existed only in years of exceptional prosperity. In the effect upon wages which such a scheme would produce, they must first of all think of the miners who were paid by the piece. These men, with shorter hours, would not be able to produce so much coal, and consequently their wages would be diminished while in the case of the miners paid by the,day, one of two things would happen. Either they must be paid the same as at present, despite the shorter hours, which would mean additional cost of production, or there must be a reduction in proportion to the shorter hours. In the county of Durham he anticipated no great difficulty, because it was gratifying to think that very friendly relations existed between employers and employed, thanks to the excellent work of the Board of Conciliation. It was obvious that the managers of the coal mines must look after their own interests, and the scheme would militate against the employment of older men. It had been said that the Bill would not affect the safety of a colliery, but he thought it would, because if the men were employed shorter hours it would be to their interest to accelerate the work done, and if the winding and hauling arrangements were unduly hastened there was danger to be apprehended. He did not believe the Bill would realise the benefits the promoters claimed for it.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) supported the Bill, not only because he had the honour to represent in that House 11,000 coal miners, but also because he conscientiously believed it to be a measure of justice. Having regard to the arduous and dangerous character of mining employment, he held emphatically that it was right and proper that there should be legislative interference with the hours of labour. The main opposition to the Bill emanated from Durham. Originally the opposition came from the counties of Northumberland and Durham, but he was glad to know that on this occasion the majority, at all events, of the miners in Northumberland had fallen into line with the miners who supported the Bill. Durham now was the only exception. As regarded the difficulties of the application of the measure to the county of Durham, he could not help feeling that they had been greatly exaggerated. At the present time, out of 93,000 men and boys employed in the Durham collieries, 69,000 were already working only eight hours or under, and only 24,000, including boys, were working more than eight hours. The noble Lord who spoke last was afraid that if the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill was passed the Durham hewers would not be able to continue producing coal at the present rate. It was incorrect to state that the average hours of the Durham hewers was now seven hours fifty-two minutes from bank to bank, because in the evidence given before the Departmental Committee it was shown that the average period per day of coal hewers' work was only six hours and forty-nine minutes from bank to bank. That being so, any fear of a diminution in the output so far as the working at the coal face was concerned fell to the ground. The coal hewer would work the same length of time, in fact he could work longer, if he desired to do so, and the consuming public need have no fear that the production of coal on the face would suffer a decrease; the reverse would probably be the case. The problem they had to face in the county of Durham was how to get the coal from the face to the surface under the Eight Hours Bill. To get to bank the produce of two shifts in eight hours, which they now got to bank in ten hours, was the problem they had to face. They knew that they could bring to their aid increased mechanical appliances. His opinion was, that if a large number of our older collieries were owned by citizens of the United States of America they would dismantle the antiquated plants and fit the mines with modern appliances, which would mean that they would employ mechanical haulage and electricity to bring the coal from the workings at the face to the bottom of the shaft, to an infinitely greater extent than those appliances were at present employed. They would increase enormously the weight of coal raised by each lift of the winding engine from the bottom of the shaft to the surface. An increased number of coal tubs might also be filled in advance of the hours of winding. With the adoption of such measures the difficulties in the way of the Bill would be largely if not altogether overcome. There was no difference of opinion as to the desirability of reducing the hours of labour of boys employed underground. He was glad to know that Northumberland was now supporting the reduction of the hours of boys to eight hours, and all agreed in the desirability of reducing the hours of labour of boys, yet they had at the present time in the county of Durham men who were working from bank to bank only six hours and forty-nine minutes, while the boys were working nine hours and forty-five minutes, according to evidence given before the Departmental Committee. That was a condition of things which they ought to exercise all the ingenuity they possessed to overcome and redress. He was glad to know that this measure passed the Second Reading last year without challenge. To-day it appeared that the same course would be pursued. [Sir F. BANBURY: No.] He knew that his hon. friend the Member for the City of London, who had the courage of his convictions, would even go into the lobby alone, provided he could get tellers. He dared say that they would have the pleasure of a division, and that this measure would have the *éclat* of passing its Second Reading by an unprecedented and overwhelming majority. Endeavours had been made to create the impression that its passage would enormously increase the cost of coal, and, therefore, seriously injure those manufactures which depended upon the coal. He had read a good deal of the evidence contained in the two Bluebooks which had been issued by the Departmental Committee, and he had there seen an illustration of how extravagant and exaggerated statements were made. In the case of the Workmen's Compensation Act it was said that the passing of that Act would raise the price of coal by 3d. or 4d., or even 6d. per ton. What had proved to be the result? He happened to be interested in a mutual insurance association of coalowners in the county of Durham, and he thought his hon. friend the Member for Mid. Durham would be able to confirm him when he said that the average cost of the Workmen's Compensation Act to the coalowners of the county of Durham had been only two-thirds of a penny per ton. Representations had been made that the working of the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill would increase the cost of the production of coal by as much as 2s. per ton. He could only say from his own knowledge of coal mining that they were entitled to take a similar discount off those statements which experience proved had to be taken off the statements with regard to the cost of the Workmen's Compensation Act. He did not deny that the cost of production of coal, at any rate for some years, would be increased by the operation of this Bill. He had two carefully prepared statements by a number of colliery managers in the county of Durham as to what, in their opinion, would be the economic effect of the application of the Bill. In one case the estimate was an increased cost of 3d. per ton and in the other case an increased cost of 4d. per ton. He thought, however, that he was warranted in saying that within a reasonable time that increased cost would be somewhat reduced. While they were face to face with an increase in the cost of coal in the endeavour to solve this problem, yet it would be no such disastrous increase as would prove injurious to coal consuming industries, and the reasons in support of the Bill were such as to justify the demand for a limitation of the hours of labour. A young lad of the age of thirteen years, who had to get up at five o'clock in the morning to go to work for ten hours underground, could not be fit at the close of that period, either physically or mentally, for anything in the nature of evening classes or the continuance of educational pursuits. He considered that the community had no right to impose onerous conditions upon any section for their own enrichment. Even if they had to pay a trifle more for their coal it was worth the cost, if it could be shown that they were raising the standard of education and encouraging and improving the growing lads who were employed in the coal trade to the number of 65,000. There was a good case for the sympathetic consideration and support of the House, and he had the greatest pleasure in supporting the Second Reading.

*MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.) said that if he might judge from the number of petitions which he had received from the various mining districts of Lanarkshire in favour of this Bill, he was satisfied that the miners there were very anxious that it should become law. He had no personal knowledge of underground work, and he desired to remain above ground as long as he might be permitted, but he felt that eight hours was a long enough time for anyone to be below ground. He was very gratified indeed to hear the sympathetic support already given by the House to the Bill. They had in Lanarkshire some conditions which did not obtain in other parts of the country, for they had there a large proportion of alien labour, which he thought was not desirable from the point of view that many of the foreign miners were unacquainted with the English language. All these things helped to accentuate the difficulties which the miners in Lanarkshire experienced in connection with their employment. He was not one of those who took a pessimistic view of the difficulties this Bill might create, because he believed, with the hon. Member who had just spoken, that there were ways and means by which those difficulties could be overcome. One was also gratified to know that in regard to ventilation and other improvements which had been adopted, the condition of the miners was superior to what it was not so very long ago. But notwithstanding all these advantages, he was satisfied that the Bill was desired by the large majority of miners in Scotland and he hoped it would have a Second Reading by consent of the House.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.), who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the arguments of the hon. Member for Barnsley were hardly in favour of the Bill. According to the hon. Member's own showing, in Durham and Northumberland the hewers worked six hours forty-nine minutes, and that had been done, not by a compulsory Act of Parliament, but by arrangement between the coalowners and workmen. Nobody would pretend that in the county of Durham they approved of long hours for boys, but he maintained that the conditions could be better ameliorated by mutual and friendly arrangement than by a hard-and-fast Act of Parliament. The hon. Member who moved the Second Reading of the Bill had told them that the evidence given before the Departmental Committee could be understood by every schoolboy. He was very glad to be told so, because the instructions given to the Committee were of such a character that he was reminded of Captain Kidd. The Committee had a sort of roving commission, and the subjects they had to consider were so numerous that he rather doubted whether they could be understood by every schoolboy. Anyone who read the evidence given before the Committee upstairs would see that they had the testimony only partially before them. They had not received the evidence of two of the principal districts —Northumberland and Durham. He was informed that one of them was in favour of the Bill and that the other was against it. Surely it would be premature on the part of the House to come to a decision before, at all events, they had heard the evidence of those two districts. Mr. Cunningham, one of the witnesses who had given evidence before the Committee, said the Bill was perfectly useless, because it did not lay down what had got to be done. The same witness also said that it was not of the slightest use to pass an Act saying that a man should not remain underground more than eight hours if Parliament did not provide directions or means by which it could be carried out. Mr. Cunningham went on to say that if the Home Office had to carry it out they would require a very much larger staff than they had at the present moment; and he pointed out various difficulties that would arise with the Home Office unless it was instructed by Parliament how to deal with these matters. Mr. Cunningham also referred to the eight hours day in France, and his evidence went to show that the conditions in that country under the Act were very wide indeed, and did not apply to every man below ground; there were numerous exemptions. It had also been pointed out by the hon. Member for Gateshead that in the case of Durham the Bill would increase instead of shorten the hours of labour. He hoped that the House would pause before it consented to pass this Bill, which had been thrown in the teeth of the Government, who had appointed a Committee to examine into the great economic processes which were involved in the question. The members of the Committee were taking the greatest pains to arrive at a decision on these economic questions, which were not such as every schoolboy could understand; and he regarded it almost as an insult to that Committee to say that the inquiry in which they were engaged was such as could be understood by every schoolboy. He hoped that the Bill would be resisted by the Government who had appointed that Committee, and that the House would wait until they had the evidence before them, so that they might be enabled to arrive at a definite and sound conclusion on this important matter.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) said it was hardly necessary for him to tell the House that the Government supported the Second Reading of this Bill. Last year, when the Bill was before the House, he stated the position of the Government. That position they not only adhered to, but were bound to adhere to. He had listened very carefully to the debate, and in particular to the speeches of the hon. mover and seconder. Perhaps he might be allowed to congratulate both hon. Members on the excellence and eloquence of their speeches. But his hon. friend the Member for Ince had told the House not exactly in terms, but he wished the House to understand, that neither he nor anyone else who knew anything about the subject, had anything to learn—["No, no."]—at an rate, that this Bill has been brought before the House for something like twenty years, that the arguments were worn threadbare, and that there was no reason for the appointment of a Committee, as it could throw no light on any subjects which were necessary to the consideration of the Bill, and that, in fact, it was a waste of time endeavouring to get fresh evidence or fresh light on the matter. Might he point out to the House this fact? They agreed that so far as the general figures which bore on this great issue were concerned, the figures showing output and the number of workers and so on—the broad general figures—they had ample information. But those were not the figures necessary to detailed examination when they came to the practical drafting of the Bill. General knowledge was an excellent thing, he agreed. His hon. friend had much general knowledge, he knew. He had special and particular knowledge of the industry with which he was connected. He could instruct most of them on the practical working of a colliery. But that was not enough, when they were considering this question, as he should have occasion to point out in the course of his remarks. He was in a somewhat difficult position, because he had to justify the action of the Government in setting up this Committee, which had been and was being talked of by many hon. Members on both sides of the House as being unnecessary. No man occupying the position he did, and responsible for the department which had to administer the Coal Mines Act, would take the responsibility of accepting the Bill as it stood as the basis upon which to work. In appointing the Committee the Government acted honestly to get information so as to be able to fill in the details of the measure. If that Committee had been appointed for dilatory purposes because they wished to avoid an awkward question, then he agreed hon. Members would have a serious grievance, but there was no idea of dilatory tactics. The appointment of the Committee was an honest action designed to further the Bill, the principle of which was accepted last year. Nothing was more objectionable to a Minister or a Department than to have hanging over their heads a great question unsettled. The question cropped up continually, and it was always giving trouble. Every administrator who knew his business wished to get through his work not only at the earliest possible moment, but in the most practical form possible. If the result of the appointment of this Committee had been to delay the Bill then he was one of the principal sufferers, because it put not only himself but his Department to great inconvenience and trouble. No one would deny that the gentlemen who served on the Committee were eminently qualified, and had worked exceedingly hard to get through their task. They would probably finish in a few weeks. There had been no delay there. It should be remembered this was but the second session of a new Parliament, and they had six years before them. He had been somewhat disappointed that the Committee had not been able to report earlier. When appointed, the Committee had asked for information necessary to open up the questions left to them, and the Home Office had not the requisite information.

MR. WALSH said they knew all about the evidence given before the Committee, but it was being given in a glorified form.

*MR. GLADSTONE said it was essential to have exact information. For instance, in the debate last year it was stated that the average number of days miners worked was four a week. Exact inquiries proved the average number of days per week in 1906 worked by collieries was five and-a-quarter, and that the average number of hours worked by men fell short of the maximum by seven per cent. That showed that the figures previously given to the House would not bear the test of inquiry. He maintained that it was necessary to have exact information upon these very important points. If he were to ask any hon. Member representing the miners to give him the figures showing how many men now worked eight hours or less from bank to bank underground, and how many worked above eight hours, could he answer? He knew that no hon. Member could answer that question unless he had seen the Return compiled by the Committee. He was sure the House would at once realise how important figures of that sort were. He was not arguing against the Bill, but simply giving facts in support of the appointment of the Committee. In legislating to impose a uniform eight hours day upon all miners in the country, it was important to know how many men the Act would affect. The figures showed that an eight hours limit, whether right or wrong, would have a very considerable effect; for the number of men who worked eight hours, or less, from bank to bank was 131,000, whereas the number of those who worked more than eight hours was 449,000. These figures were in favour of those who supported the Bill, because they showed that the larger number of men were working longer than they ought.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) asked if those figures included boys.

*MR. GLADSTONE replied that the figures included the boys working underground. He would like to tell the House what information they had before the Committee was appointed. There was a Return moved for in 1890, and there was the table of statistics placed before the Royal Commission on Labour in 1892. That was the last table issued which gave any details of the rates of wages paid per week in the collieries, but the table had been compiled from sources which were not authoritative. Therefore, it would be seen that the only Return they had was one issued some fifteen years ago. Further, the Government wanted reliable information as to the different methods of working in the different districts, and the number of mines likely to be seriously affected, or perhaps irretrievably damaged, by an absolute limitation of hours. They were in possession of no information as to the probable effect upon prices of an Eight Hours Mines Act. He agreed with the mover and seconder of the Bill that the prophecies of ruin and loss had been greatly exaggerated. Certainly, they would not be sufficient to deter the House from going forward with the Bill. At the same time, it was essential to know how they stood. The speculations hazarded by hon. Members were not so reliable as the facts obtained by a close, careful and exact scientific examination and consideration of all the circumstances and conditions. The preparation and tabulation of the figures had caused much more delay than he expected, because the information at the disposal of the Government was found to be much less than he anticipated last year when he spoke upon the subject. And was not such information necessary? Was not the least that any responsible Government would do, which wished to forward the prospects of the Bill, to obtain that information? The price of coal was a matter of interest to everybody, not only to steamship and railway companies and manufacturers, but also to wage earners. He was not deterred by the consideration that some people—not only coal-owners, but certainly some coal-miners also—would suffer by this Bill. Small disturbances and difficulties could not be regarded when there was a great public object in view. But it must be remembered that in this great industry, including the metalliferous mines, 900,000 persons were employed, and when they considered how the trade of the country depended to a large extent on the price of coal, it was the first duty of the Government to know how they stood before they took the responsibility of passing a Bill like this, which would undoubtedly effect a very great change. He would like to give to the House one or two other illustrations of what he meant. He asked hon. Members how they accounted for the change which had come over the Forest of Dean in regard to this question. His right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean was a convinced supporter of the eight hours day principle, and he had taken a leading part in support of this measure ever since it had been before the House. But what had happened? He reminded the House that the agent of the Forest of Dean miners gave evidence before the Committee on this subject, and his evidence was against this proposal. Why had the miners of the Forest of Dean changed their opinion?

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): And the owners. the owners have accepted a limitation.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he did not quote this against the Bill—he was for the Bill—but he only quoted it to show that the problem was not so simple. He would tell the House why the Forest of

Dean miners had changed their views. The ways in that district were very long, and two to three hours were occupied in going to and from the coal face. Two or three hours per day would be taken from the eight hours day.

MR. WALSH: You can consider this in Committee.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he would ask his hon. friend whether, with these facts before them, the Government could go before a Committee, and make themselves responsible for the Bill? It would have to be in a very different shape before it could pass the House. It would be his duty as representing the Government to graft on to the Bill as they went along many additional clauses which were necessary. He would have to ascertain what was the reason for this action on the part of the miners of the Forest of Dean, and he would have to consider whether the evidence of their agent was such as would force him to consider their case and meet it in the Bill. On each point he would have to consider all the circumstances he had indicated, and his position would be simply impossible. The experience of the French had not been touched upon. In this matter France was ahead of this country, because they had already got what was called an eight hours law. Perhaps he might remind the House of the nature of that law. It laid down that six months after the passing of the Act the time worked by coal hewers was not to exceed nine hours calculated from the last batch of men entering the pit to the arrival above ground of the first men. There were many exemptions and exceptions to meet special circumstances of different mines and emergencies. Was it proposed to make exemptions and exceptions in this Bill? The French, who considered this question practically, included in their Act such provisions as they thought necessary, and also limited its scope to what they thought would be safe, having regard to all the circumstances of the case. But now, two years later, they found that an amendment of the Act was necessary. They found the greatest difficulty in enforcing the Act. There were certain penalties provided in regard to the enforcement of the Act, but they said that in many respects the Act had failed, and that it could not be enforced. They had tried "peaceful persuasion," but it had not succeeded. It was true that they were proposing to extend the limitation of the hours to all classes of underground workers. They found that difficult in working out, and they were now engaged drafting a new Bill. Although at every point that Bill was made elastic by the granting of exemptions, after two years experience they found it necessary to amend it. That went to show that our position must be looked at, at least as carefully as the French were looking at their position. The number of miners employed in this country was three or four times as great as the number engaged in the coal industry of France. Moreover the coal industry of this country was of far greater national importance, and of far greater importance to the individual, than the coal industry of France was to the trade and commerce of that country. There were one or two points he wished to dwell upon, partly because they were suggested by the French experience, and partly because they had been brought up and were being dealt with by the Committee. This Bill proposed a hard and fast limitation of eight hours for all underground workers. Were they going to allow any exemptions? If so, what were they? That was a matter which wanted most careful consideration. How would it be in the case of the higher officials underground—the managers, firemen and overmen, or whatever the term might be, who were concerned with the safety of the mine? The duty of those men was to go down the pit, very often two hours before the men, to see that all was safe, and some of them had to stay in the mine till after the men were withdrawn. Therefore, supposing, for the sake of argument, that those men were working ten hours, was that exception to be made? If the exception was not to be made, they would force the mine-owners to double that particular branch of their staff in order to make good the deficiency caused by the overlapping of a couple of hours. That was a question of importance. There was the question of a possible reduction of the output, which had an important bearing on the question of the price of coal. In France, according to his information, the attempt to work an eight hours day for the men had been to cause a reduction in the output of 5 per cent. It would probably be higher in this country if it were a uniform eight hours day. The question was what would be the amount of the rise in price, and would it be likely to last? The question whether there would be a reduction of output in exact proportion to the restriction of hours was now before the Departmental Committee. He would point out one great advantage of the work of the Committee. As a matter of fact public opinion had treated this question as in the nature of a "hardy annual." There were some well known Bills which came up year after year, sometimes they were read a second time and sometimes not, but until they arrived at a certain stage—the stage of being practically considered—those concerned did not trouble to put their houses in order so as to meet possible changes in the law. In this case hon. Members who supported the Bill said with great force that there would not be any rise in price, because owing to improvements in mechanical haulage in raising coal, in the better organisation of collieries, and so forth, it would be possible to make up the deficiency. That was true, but the advantage of what they were doing through the Departmental Committee was that mine owners were to be called upon to give evidence and to state their case, the Government having declared their intention to bring in a Bill dealing with the subject. Therefore, the mine owners all over the country would have to consider the best practical methods by which to meet the decrease in the output of coal, so that there might be as little difference in the output and in the price as possible in the circumstances. Then there was the question of exemptions. Were they going to make any exemptions? Let them take the case of old collieries where the distance to the face was very great. There were old mines which had been working for a hundred years and more, which gave employment to between forty and 100 men. Did they propose to make any exception as to those? What did they propose to do in the case of an accident which interfered with the enforcement of the eight hours day? Were they going to take any notice of the seasonal trade? He was informed that in the Cannock Chase district, where the business of the pits was chiefly in house coal, during the summer months the pits were working three and four days a week, and the men looked for special conditions in the winter in order to average the general wage of the year. Were they going to make any exception in the case of a district like that? Again, if ten hours were needed for the winding of coal in a particular pit, were the persons engaged on the roads or in winding not to be allowed to work underground more than eight hours? If not, there would be a great restriction of output. These were points which had to be taken into consideration. He absolutely declined to admit that any Home Secretary could settle them before the House in Committee, or in a Committee upstairs. The Bill made no attempt to deal with one important matter which was distinct from the work of the Committee. Hon. Members had not said what they proposed in regard to the enforcement of the provisions of the Bill. Who was to be responsible for the record of men going down the mine and coming up? Were the miners or the owners to be fined for contraventions of the law? It was hardly fair to leave all these important points to be worked out, not by those who were responsible for the Bill, but by the Government when they took it up. His hon. friends might say what they liked, these were matters which must be settled before the Government put their skilled experts to draft a measure. He thanked the House for listening to him with so much patience. He regretted the delay that had occurred. It was due to the fact that they were getting the necessary information, but he could assure the House that the Government had not, and never had had, the slightest intention of playing fast and loose with any Member of the House interested in this matter. They were acting in the best interest of all those who had brought in the Bill. They were awaiting the Report of the Departmental Committee without which they could not put their hands to a Bill. He hoped the Committee would present their Report by Whitsuntide. As soon as they got that Report they would take the Bill in hand and have it introduced in the House. He did not think any reasonable man could ask them to do more in this second session of a new Parliament, when they were all struggling day by day to keep their heads above the mass of work which flowed in upon them from every side. Might he make an appeal to his hon. friends, even to those who were most specially responsible for this

Bill, to remember that, as soon as the debate was over, the Government would be pressed to give facilities for other matters of equal or greater importance by other large combinations of Members. But in the case of a Government, as in the case of a coal mine, there was what might be called a working limit, and they cannot get out of a bottle more than the dimensions of the neck would allow. They undertook to do their best. Those who were interested in this Bill were aware that the Government itself was pledged to bring in an Eight Hours Bill. So far as he was concerned there would be no avoidable delay whatever in the carrying out of that promise.

*MR. RUSSELL REA (Gloucester) said that, as Chairman of the Departmental Committee, he recognised the fact that it would be entirely improper for him to interpose in this debate to discuss the merits of the question, but he had no hesitation in stating what the Committee was doing. After the Committee was appointed he consulted his colleagues as to the course which should be taken in the investigation of the question. He looked at the former debates on the subject, but he found himself no wiser with respect to certain matters on which information was essential. Then they went to the Departments. They found that the information at the Home Office was very scanty. When the Home Office had given the Committee a statement of the national output of coal, and that of each district, the number of men employed in the various districts, and of the number of boys under sixteen, they had given all the information they had. The Board of Trade told them how many days in the various months of the year collieries had been totally idle. That was all the information got from that Department. The Committee had been asked to give a statistical and economic Report on the effect of proposed legislative changes, and they had no data on which to base a Report which would be of any scientific value whatever, so that they had to begin the task of collecting information in their own way. The first step was to design and secure the issue by the Home Office of a series of forms to the collieries of the country for the purpose of obtaining what might be called a practical census. The Committee had to thank the owners and managers of collieries for the careful way in which they had responded to the request made to them for information. The Committee were now in possession of information as to the number of men employed in the mining industry, the rates of pay, the hours worked, and other matters. When the returns were received considerable labour was involved in the tabulation and arrangement of the facts in order to bring them into an intelligible form. At one time they had a dozen clerks working overtime—considerably over eight hours a day—dealing with the statistical returns. Then the Committee opened the inquiry to the public. He might say that the employers responded extremely well. They sent their best men, but even they were incapable of judging of the question until they got the result of the preliminary inquiry as a basis for the preparation of their evidence. This was not merely a statistical question. They had to consider it in its economical, physiological, psychological, and mechanical aspects. These were matters which came within the purview of the inquiry, and must be reported on. The Committee had not lost any time. They were appointed last summer and they at once began the preliminary investigations. They formulated their tables and sent them out. The hon. Member for Ince and his friends took six months to give the simple answer "No" to a question which was addressed to them. He wished to say that when the Committee were enabled to present there Report they would give to the House the materials for forming a broader opinion on all the questions involved in this matter than they could possibly possess without that Report. The Committee had considered the matter purely from the economic side, and politics had never entered into their inquiry.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said it was somewhat satisfactory to him to find that he was justified last year, when he had the opportunity of saying a few words on the Bill, in warning hon. Members below the gangway of the dangers they ran in not voting against the Government then, but by being satisfied with the appointment of a Committee. The hon. Member for Ince, in his excellent speech, had said that the Committee had been appointed with terms of reference so wide and vague that it might sit to the day of doom. The Committee had been appointed, in his opinion, solely for the purpose of providing the Government with arguments against the Bill instead of clearing away difficulties and facilitating its passage. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no."] Well, he had listened carefully to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and he had never heard a more damaging criticism of an Eight Hours Bill. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] The whole of the right hon. Gentleman's argument centred round the effect an eight hours day would have upon the price of coal.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that that was not his argument. He had made a quotation from what had been said only as an illustration; but he had also said that he did not agree with the statement that a great advance in price was to be apprehended.

MR. COCHRANE said that the impression left on his mind, and on the minds of all other hon. Members near him, by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was that the great difficulty the right hon. Gentleman saw in the way of this particular measure was that the future price of coal would be raised, and that that would affect our shipping trade. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no."]

*MR. GLADSTONE said that it was not fair to attribute that argument to him. What he had made perfectly clear was that it was an important matter for the consideration of the country at large, and it was necessary in justice to the interest of the consumers, large and small, to make inquiry into what truth there was in the allegation.

MR. COCHRANE said that, so far as he understood, it did not appear that what he had said conflicted with the right hon. Gentleman's statement. Did the right hon. Gentleman attach any weight to the price of coal or not? He must have meant something by alluding to it. If the inquiry indicated that there would be a rise in price of coal, would the right hon. Gentleman then oppose the Bill?

*MR. GLADSTONE said he wanted to keep the hon. Member to what he had said. He denied that he had ever said anything of the kind imputed to him by the hon. Member.

MR. COCHRANE said he did not wish to misrepresent the right hon. Gentleman. Possibly he had not understood what the Home Secretary intended to convey; but it certainly was his impression that the right hon. Gentleman had brought forward every argument which could be urged as to the difficulties in the way of the operation of an eight hours day, as to the difficulty of counting time from bank to bank, as to the difficulty of employing underground managers, and as to the difficulty of making exemptions. When the Workmen's Compensation Bill was under discussion there was no difficulty in making exceptions, and he ventured to say that if the right hon. Gentleman devoted his intelligence to the matter, all such questions could very well be considered and settled in Committee of the Whole House. It might be his density, but, notwithstanding what the right hon. Gentleman had said, he failed to apprehend what was the attitude of the Government towards the Bill. After having voted for the Second Reading, would they take effective steps to s nd it upstairs to a Grand Committee? The hon. Members below the gangway congratulated themselves in having got the hon. Member for Northumberland to join the angels; but he assured those hon. Members that what they needed was not the wisdom of the angels, but the wisdom of the serpent, especially when they were dealing with a Liberal Government, if they wanted this Bill to pass. The only way to get the

Bill passed was by opposing the Liberal Government on every occasion.

MR. WALSH rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 273; Noes, 34. (Division List No. 111.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J (S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal. E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Slaveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. William Abraham and Mr. George Roberts.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Helmsley, Viscount
Hunt, Rowland
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lupton, Arnold
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Thornton, Percy M.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Captain Craig.

Question "That this Bill be now read a second time," put accordingly, and agreed to.

MR. WALSH, in moving the reference of the Bill to the Standing Committee on Trade, said that the promoters felt positive that the House might leave the consideration of the details of the Bill with perfect confidence to the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."

SIR FRANCIS POWELL hoped the House would not assent to the proposal. It was obvious that the Bill could not be carried through without the assistance and guidance of the Government, who themselves had a Departmental Committee sitting with a view to preparing a Bill of their own. Reference had been made to the Factory Act which had been sent to the Standing Committee on Trade; but that was a Government Bill, and it was in that state of things that the measure was so referred. As the very question raised by this Bill was before a Departmental Committee, he thought, before proceeding further, they should wait for the Report of that Committee. It seemed to him that for the House to refer the Bill to the Standing Committee on Trade, which must sit almost immediately, would, under the circumstances, be inadvisable.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) who spoke amidst cries of "Divide," said hon. Members had half an hour in which to divide. He was surprised, after the speech of the Home Secretary, that the Government appeared to be willing to accept the Motion which had been made by the hon. Gentleman below the gangway. The Home Secretary, indeed, made a very good case against sending the Bill to the Committee on Trade at all, and defended the appointment of the Departmental Committee on the ground that it was necessary to get a certain amount of information which was not in the possession of the Home Office or of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had shown that very important information relating to the details of the Bill and its proper working was not in the possession of the Government or of the hon. Members who moved and seconded the Bill. That statement was not challenged by those hon. Members. Then the right hon. Gentleman had pointed out, in perfectly clear language, that it would be impossible for any Home Secretary, however able, to conduct this Bill in the Committee, because there were so many additional details which would have to be put into it for which it would not afford the proper framework. The right hon. Gentleman had said that a great number of clauses would have to be added to the Bill. Were they going again to go through the farce which they had in regard to the Land Tenure Bill? They on that side allowed the Land Tenure Bill to go through, and when it came back to the House clauses were drafted and alterations made which had to be pencilled on the knees of the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General. That was a thing he had never seen before in the fifteen years that he had been in the House. There was no excuse for sending a badly drafted Bill like this to the Committee on Trade. As the right hon. Gentleman had said, before they drafted a Bill they must know what they were going to do. The Departmental Committee was not appointed for the purpose of drawing up a Bill, but for the purpose of assisting the Home Secretary to draw up a good Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman had said that the Committee would report in a month's time and that the Government would, on the Report of that Committee, draft a proper Bill. Under these circumstances how could the Government approve of this Bill going to a Grand Committee? Unless they contemplated that the whole of the time of the Committee would be wasted what was the use of sending the Bill to them? The Government had pledged themselves to introduce a Bill of their own. There could not be two Bills on the same subject in the same session—one of them must be dropped. Hon. Members, it seemed, were extremely anxious to have this Bill carried without considering what its effect would be upon the country; but it was important in the interests of hon. Gentlemen themselves, that they should have a measure which was properly considered and workable. Under these circumstances he hoped the Home Secretary would pluck up a little courage and stand by his own speech, which was a very excellent one from the point of view he was now urging.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) said the hon. Baronet had, as usual, made a clear, emphatic, and eloquent speech in opposition to the further progress of this Bill. It was the usual speech which was made on all private Members' Bills, and even if they granted that there was some force in it, all that it meant was that the hon. Gentleman was strongly opposed to the Bill. For his part he saw no reason whatever why departure should be made in this case from the ordinary procedure. It would be very strange indeed if the Government, who were now endeavouring to persuade the House to take this course with all Bills, were to step in to help in hindering this Bill from going upstairs. If the Committee found that the Bill was so poor a foundation that they could not build upon it, they could send it back in such a shape as to convey to the House that it did not afford good groundwork for legislation. The Committee might take any course they liked. They might refuse to proceed with it.

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL inquired whether the right hon. Gentleman really meant that a Standing Committee could refuse to proceed with a Bill referred to it by the House.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN replied that they could not in a technical sense refuse, but they could send it back to the House in such a way as to convey to the House that it was not a suitable ground on which to build legislation. Another thing they could do was to suspend the proceedings on the Bill until the Government Bill was introduced, and then have the Government Bill before them and consider it also. But let the House take the usual course. Let the Bill go upstairs so that not only its details should be considered, but all the possible Amendments to it, with a view to new conditions and modifications being brought forward. That was the ordinary and straightforward course, and it was the course which the Government would recommend.

Mr. LAMBTON asked whether the Bill was to go upstairs merely for the purpose of making room for a fresh Government Bill? If that was the course the Government were going to take under the amended rules of procedure it might lead to great confusion.

Sir CHRISTOPHER FURNESS (Hartlepool) said that he was a Member of the Grand Committee on Trade, and anxious to arrive at a wise conclusion on this subject. He desired to know whether this Bill would seriously affect a large number of our industries, and for that purpose it was important that he should study the Report of the Committee which was considering the subject. Until that Committee had made its Report he could not regard himself as competent to vote on the Bill if it were sent to the Grand Committee on Trade.

*Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) objected to referring the Bill to the Grand Committee, not, like the previous speaker, because he was a Member of the Committee, but because he was not a Member of the Committee. He was a mining engineer and had been interested in this subject all his life, but when the matter came up for consideration he would have no opportunity of saying anything. Therefore, he supported the hon. Member who had just sat down, but for a different reason from that which he had given.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 279; Noes, 33. (Division List No. 112.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-

Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh.
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, F. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C E (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset E.

Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. John Ward and Mr. George Roberts.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Dalyrmple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hunt, Rowland
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Paulton, James Miller
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Thornton, Percy M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Whitehead, Rowland
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Captain Craig.

SWEATED INDUSTRIES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle), in rising to move the Second Reading of the Sweated Industries Bill, said he thought it was a great misfortune that, as it was nearly five o'clock, there would be no real opportunity of discussing the measure. But he was sure that there was such a consensus of opinion in favour of something being done to mitigate the evils of sweating that it was a most unfortunate thing that such should be the case. The Bill, he admitted, introduced, so far as this country was concerned, a new principle for dealing with what was acknowledged to be a very serious, if not a menacing, condition of things to the industrial life of the country. The Bill proposed to deal with the evil by scheduling a limited number of trades in which it was known that sweating existed in an extraordinary degree. To begin with, the schedule of the Bill contained the tailoring trade, the dressmaking trade, and the trades which included the making, trimming, and altering of shirts. It was proposed to set up a Wages Board, consisting of equal numbers of employers and employed, which would have power to fix a minimum rate of wages, which, for the time being, should govern the work in those particular trades. The principle of fixing a minimum rate of wage was not a new principle. It was known to some of them who were connected with large organisations of labour, but there it was done upon a voluntary basis. The new principle was that it was proposed to give the Board, by statutory authority, power to fix a minimum wage.

And, it being Five o'clock, the debate stood adjourned.

SELECTION.

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection, "That they had nominated the following five Members to serve on the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons, on the Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill and the Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill:—Mr. Charles Duncan, Sir John Randles, Mr. Rose, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Luke White.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at two minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 15*th April*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [H.L.]; Humber Conservancy Bill [H.L.]; Borax Consolidated Bill [H.L.]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [H.L.]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [H.L.]; Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]. Petition for additional provision; of the Coventry Corporation under their Common Seal, together with the proposed clauses and Amendments annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners.

Basingstoke Gas Bill; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill; Brockenhurst Gas Bill; Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill; Maidstone Gas Bill; Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill. Brought from the Commons, read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Byrne's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Message from the Commons for copy of the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings taken before this House, together with the documents deposited in the case. Ordered to be communicated, with a request that they may be returned.

Galway's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Fitzgerald's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Minutes of evidence and proceedings before this House on the Second Reading, together with the documents deposited in the cases, returned from the Commons.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]. Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.]. Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]. Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]. Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.]. Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Marquess of Zetland be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Zouche of Haryngworth; read, and agreed to.

Glasgow Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [H.L.]. The meeting of the Select Committee (which stands appointed for Tuesday the 30th instant) put off to Monday the 6th of May next.

PETITIONS.

JUDICATURE BILL. [H.L.]

Petition against, of Manchester Incorporated Law Association; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the following Papers, having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty, had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.:

1. Treaty Series, No. 11 (1907). Accessions of British Colonies, etc., to various Treaty engagements between the United Kingdom and Foreign Powers. (March 27.)

2. Militia Units. Return showing the establishment of each unit of Militia in the United Kingdom, and the numbers present, absent, and wanting to complete at the training of 1906 (in continuation of [Cd. 2697] of session 1906). (March 27.)

3. Bobbinite (Departmental Committee). Report of the Departmental Committee on Bobbinite: Report and appendices. (March 27.)

4. Explosives (Explosion of Nitro-Glycerine at Ardeer, near Stevenston, Ayrshire)—Report to the Secretary of

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

State for the Home Department on the circumstances attending an explosion of nitro-glycerine which occurred at the factory of Nobel's Explosives Company, Limited, at Ardeer, near Stevenston, Ayrshire, on 5th February, 1907. (27th March.)

5. Colonies (General)—Circular dispatch, dated 15th February, 1907, relative to the part taken by ex-Governors of Colonies in the organisation or direction of companies formed to operate in territories which they were recently administering. (27th March.)

6. Trade Reports—I. Annual Series.

No. 3752. Belgium (Port of Antwerp; Shipping and Navigation for 1906).

No. 3753. Santo Domingo (Trade for the First Six Months of 1906). (4th April.)

No. 3754. Portugal (Trade of the Azores for 1906). (6th April.)

No. 3755. Sudan (Trade of Port Sudan for 1906).

No. 3756. Honduras (Trade for 1905–1906).

No. 3757. Venezuela (Trade of Ciudad Bolivar for 1906). (10th April.)

No. 3758. Bolivia (Trade for 1906).

No. 3759. France (Trade of New Caledonia for 1906).

No. 3760. Honduras (Trade of Puerto Cortes for 1906).

No. 3761. Chile (Trade of Coquimbo for 1906).

No. 3762. Portugal (Trade of Oporto for 1906). (13th April.)

II. (Miscellaneous Series).

No. 657. Liquor Traffic Legislation of the United States. (4th April.)

No. 658. Mexican Isthmus (Tehuantepec Railway). (6th April.)

7. Egypt, No. 1. (1907)—Reports by His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General on the finances, administration, and condition of Egypt and the Soudan in 1906. (4th April.)

8. Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission)—

I. Calendar of the Stuart Papers belonging to His Majesty the King, preserved at Windsor Castle. Volume III.

II. Report on the manuscripts of the Earl of Ancaster, preserved at Grimsthorpe. (4th April.)

9. Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905—Report by the Local Government Board for Scotland as to the proceedings of Distress Committees in Scotland. (4th April.)

10. Mines (Eight-Hour Day for Miners) First Report (with evidence) of a Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to inquire into the probable economic effect of a limit of eight hours to the working day of coal miners. (4th April.)

11. Railway Accidents—Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ended 31st December, 1906, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871), together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into. Part I. Returns of accidents. (4th April.)

12. Commercial—No. 3. (1907)—Return of Most-Favoured Nation Clauses in existing treaties of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies: In force on the 1st January, 1907.

No. 4. (1907)—Return of National Treatment Clauses in existing treaties of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Foreign Powers, stating the period when terminable, and showing whether they apply to the British Colonies: In force on the 1st January, 1907. (5th April.)

13. Local Government (Scotland). Return of the areas, population, and valuation of counties, burghs, and parishes in Scotland. (6th April.)

14. Police (Scotland). Forty-ninth Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland, for the

year ended 31st December, 1906. (6th April.)

15. Army—

I. Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 1907. Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War, with tables showing the war establishments and composition of the proposed field force and other particulars. (8th April.)

II. Memorandum showing how various enactments are affected by the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill. (9th April.)

III. General Annual Report on the British Army for the year ended 30th September, 1906, with which is incorporated the Annual Report of Recruiting prepared by command of the Army Council. (10th April.)

IV. Interim Report of the War Office Committee on the Provision of Officers (*a*) for Service with the Regular Army in War; and (*b*) for the Auxiliary Forces—Minutes of evidence with an appendix on the conference between the committee and the sub-committee of the Headmasters' Conference. (13th April.)

16. Education (Scotland)—

I. General Report by the Chief Inspector of the Southern Division of Scotland, for the year 1906. (10th April.)

II. General Report by Dr. W. Leslie-Mackenzie on the teaching of school and personal hygiene to students in training as teachers in Scotland. (13th April.)

17. Reformatory and Industrial Schools. Fiftieth Report for the year 1906, of the inspector of reformatory and industrial schools: Part I. Lists of schools and detailed reports. (11th April.)

18. Public Records. Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. (12th April.)

19. Board of Education (Special Grants). Statement showing the amount of the special grants paid during the financial year 1906–1907 in aid of certain local education authorities in England and Wales. (12th April.)

20. Royal Observatory (Edinburgh). Seventeenth Annual Report of the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland. (13th April.)

21. Marriages, Births, and Deaths. General abstract of marriages, births, and deaths registered in England and Wales in the year 1906. (13th April.)

22. Imports and Exports at Prices of 1900. Tables showing for each of the years 1900–1906, the estimated value of the imports and exports of the United Kingdom at the prices prevailing in 1900, with an introductory memorandum (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 2894], 1906). (13th April.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY (TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL, 1907).

Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War, with tables showing the war establishments and composition of the proposed field force and other particulars.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Regulations made by the Lord-Lieutenant prescribing the manner in which sporting rights vested in the Land Commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 13 of the Act are to be dealt with by the Land Commission.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of June, 1906.

(Proceedings.) Return for the month of February, 1907.

BARONETAGE.

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into certain matters connected with the baronetage; report and appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ARMY.

Amendments to rules for military prisons and detention barracks.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCES AND ANNUITIES.

Account of all moneys received on account of contracts for the grant of deferred life annuities and for payments on death, and of the disposal thereof; and of the contracts made for the year ended 31st December, 1906.

EGYPTIAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1885.

Account up to 31st March, 1907.

GREEK LOAN OF 1898.

Account up to 31st March, 1907.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury minute, dated 16th March, 1907, removing the office of Assistant to the Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew from the operation of Section 4 of the Superannuation Act, 1859.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.

Account of moneys received and paid by the Chamberlain of the city of London for the year 1906; also account of extraordinary works executed other than general repairs for the same period.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FUND (ACCOUNTS 1905-1906).

Accounts of receipts and payments by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Irish Land Purchase Fund, in the year ended 31st March, 1906, together with the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon.

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

The Postal Order (Foreign and Colonial) Amendment (No. 3) Regulations, 1907, dated 20th March, 1907; (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, Rhodesia.) The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 3) Warrant, 1907, dated 22nd March, 1907.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF ESSEX).

Order made by council of county of Essex dividing the Bowers Gifford Polling District in the Mid-Essex Parliamentary Division.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

(Borough of Ipswich.) Order made by the council of the borough of Ipswich, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough; (Urban District of Wallasey.) Order made by the council of the urban district of Wallasey, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban district.

GAS COMPANIES (METROPOLIS).

Accounts of the Metropolitan gas companies for the year 1906.

INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND).

Return of all loans raised in England under the provisions of any Acts of Parliament, chargeable on the revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended 31st March, 1907, with the rates of interest and total amounts payable thereon, and the date of the termination of each loan, the debt incurred during the half-year, the moneys raised thereby during the half-year, the loans paid off or discharged during the half-year, and the loans outstanding at the close of the half-year; stating, so far as the public convenience will allow, the purpose or service for which moneys have been raised during the half-year.

COURT OF SESSION (SCOTLAND).

Act of sederunt to regulate procedure in the Court of Session.

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ACT, 1906.

Orders by the Secretary for Scotland: With regard to the establishment, powers, etc., of the new Board of Trustees and the purposes for which certain buildings shall be held; allocating certain sums out of the general fund of the Board of Manufactures.

LOCAL LOANS FUND (ACCOUNTS, 1905-1906).

Accounts of receipts and payments by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the local loans fund, for the year ended 31st March, 1906; together with a Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at half-past Four o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 15th April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Manchester Ship Canal (Various Powers) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords]; Galwey's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill,—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Central London Railway Bill,—Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Hucknall Torkard, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against;—From Arbroath; and Hamilton; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Vale of Leven, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Ayr, Cambusnethan, Camelon, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Holm, Kilsyth, Kirriemuir, Renton, Rothesay, Stenhousemuir, and Thurso; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Camberwell, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Preliminary Instruction of Elementary School Teachers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th March; *Dr. Macnamara*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 108.]

ARMY.

Copy presented of Interim Report of the War Office Committee on the Provision of Officers (a) for Service with the Regular Army in War, and (b) for the Auxiliary Forces. Minutes of Evidence, with an Appendix, on the Conference between the Committee and the Sub-Committee of the Head Masters' Conference [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BARONETAGE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to inquire into certain matters connected with the Baronetage. Report and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS AT PRICES OF 1900.

Copy presented, of Tables showing for each of the years 1900-6 the estimated Value of Imports and Exports of the United Kingdom at the prices prevailing in 1900, with an introductory Memorandum [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Local Loans Fund, Accounts of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Local Loans Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1906, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 109.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Expenditure on Law and Justice in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the total sum provided in the Estimates for Law and Justice is £2,454,886 for the United Kingdom and England, £2,405,374 for Ireland, with one-tenth the population, and £388,699 for Scotland, with a population equal to that of Ireland; that the total cost of local government is £284,884 for England, £102,524 for Ireland, and £18,359 for Scotland; that the Departments of the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary for Ireland cost £83,084, and that of the Secretary for Scotland £42,792; that the office of the Registrar-General costs £9,062 in Scotland and £17,543 in Ireland; that the Board of Agriculture for England receives £199,633, and the Department of Agriculture for Ireland £238,979 a year; and whether, in view of complaints of the scale of expenditure in other Government Departments in Ireland, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The figures quoted in the Question would require much adjustment before they could be made the basis of comparison. For instance, in Ireland the cost of police is borne on the Votes of Parliament, while in Great Britain it is paid for out of local funds; many of the services borne upon the Vote for the Department of Agriculture, &c., Ireland, in the case of England form a charge on the Vote for Education, and, similarly, the Vote for the Lord-Lieutenant has to bear expenditure of a kind met in England out of the Civil List, and entirely unlike anything that is provided for in the Vote for the Secretary of Scotland. These are examples only, but there are many respects in which the sums set down for comparison do not represent analogous services. I do not know whether the hon. Member's object is to suggest a reduction of the voted provision for Ireland, but in any case I do not consider a discussion of this kind suitable for treatment by Question and Answer.

Morality of Chinese on the Rand.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colonial Office has any Report regarding the morality of the Chinese upon the Rand other than that of Mr. Bucknill, the publication of which is undesirable; and whether he can see his way to obtain from the Transvaal Government any such Report from the Rand Free Church Council, which is stated upon the authority of the Right Reverend J. T. M'Clure, D.D., Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of South Africa, to have found, presumably after inquiry, that the morality of such Chinamen is superior to that of the Kaffirs.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State has no further Report on the subject of Chinese morality, but the subject will no doubt engage the attention of the Transvaal Ministry.

Expenditure on Police in England and Wales.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the total amounts received and expended by local authorities in England and Wales on police during the last financial year, including grants from Parliament or Local Taxation Accounts, and the rate per head of the population as enumerated at the 1901 Census.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Taking the financial year 1905–6 for the Metropolitan Police, and for other police forces the nearest year for which their accounts are made up, the Answer is—

	£	s.	d.
Total cost of police	5,743,023	0	0
Cost per head of population according to 1901 Census		3	6¼

If the estimated population of 1905 is taken the cost per head is 3s. 4¼d.

Simon's Bay Dockyard.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what was the total sum reserved for contingencies in the original estimate of the Simon's Bay dockyard extension; and what are the nature and cost of the buildings which the Admiralty now proposes to abandon.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The total sum reserved for contingencies in the original estimate of the Simon's Bay dockyard extension was £369,000. The erection of buildings of the nature of coal sheds, workshops and stores, estimated to cost about £100,000, has been deferred for the present.

Expenditure on Naval Shooting Prizes.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what has been the net expenditure during the last three years on prizes for shooting in the Navy.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The expenditure on prizes for good shooting to petty officers, seamen, boys and marines during the three financial years immediately preceding 1906–7 (for which the figures are not yet available) was as follows:—

	£
1903–4	5,879
1904–5	6,144
1905–6	5,765

Navy—Special Service Vessels.

Mr. REES: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, and if no great trouble is occasioned by compliance, he will state the number of battleships, armoured cruisers, cruisers, and destroyers which belong to the class hitherto known as in special reserve, which are manned with reduced nucleus crews, and which are considered as about to fall obsolete, though still available for subsidiary purposes in war.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The hon. Member presumably refers to the special service vessels which are shown each month in the Navy List, and in the April issue will be found on page 270. They include ten battleships and seven cruisers, but no armoured cruisers or destroyers at present.

Pay of Customs Watchers.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that Customs watchers were paid at the rate of 8d. per hour for overtime work prior to the reorganisation of their class in 1896, and that 6d. per hour for overtime work is being paid to a certain number of watchers who perform duties identical with those who are paid at the higher rate; whether he is aware that the rate of 8d. per hour was paid to the outdoor officers employed on the lockers' duties now performed by the watchers; that 8d. per hour is the overtime rate paid in the Post Office and other Government Departments to men receiving the same wages as Customs watchers, viz., 24s. per week; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a uniform rate of 8d. per hour for all overtime attendance given by Customs watchers.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The class of Customs watchers was instituted, not reorganised, in 1896. The rate of overtime pay allowed to permanent labourers (the first appointees to the watcher class) was 8d. an hour, but they were not entitled to overtime pay until after a service of seventy-two hours in a week. The rate of overtime pay for watchers is 6d. an hour, but it is allowed after a service of forty-eight hours in a week. A certain number of watchers appointed to the post from that of permanent labourer in 1900 were, however allowed to retain their old rate of overtime when employed at merchants' expense, but their number is decreasing and they will in time disappear. The overtime rate of 8d. an hour was formerly paid to outdoor officers who performed, when required, the lockers' duties now assigned to watchers, but when the out-door officers' duties were divided between assistants and watchers the overtime rates were fixed for the former at 1s. per hour as against 6d. for the watcher class. It is only in London that watchers are paid at the fixed rate of 24s. per week. At the out-ports (including Tilbury, Gravesend, and Queenborough) the rate is 21s. per week, one-fourth of the total number of watchers being allowed to proceed to 24s. by annual increments of 1s. per week. The Board of Customs do not recommend the introduction of a uniform rate of 8d. an hour for overtime in the case of watchers.

Vaccination Exemption Certificate—Case of Mr. Charles Hill, of Spaxton.

Mr. MONTGOMERY (Somersetshire, Bridgwater): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Mr. Charles Hill, of Spaxton, near Bridgwater, has been twice refused exemption by the Bridgwater petty sessional magistrates under the Vaccination Acts; that in October, 1906, an order was made by the same magistrate directing him to have his child vaccinated and to pay 8s. 6d. for costs; that these he paid; that recently he was again prosecuted for disobedience to that order, and that although the justices have been advised by the Home Office that in such cases they may use their discretion, Hill was fined 12s. 6d. and costs; and whether, as Hill has no furniture upon which distraint could be levied and will eventually be committed to gaol, he will, under the circumstances, remit the fine.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The case has not previously been brought to my notice, but I will make inquiry and let the hon. Member know the result.

Income Tax—Unassessed Duty recovered by Inland Revenue Department.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if it is possible to give information to the House as to the amount of duty which, having escaped Income Tax assessment, has been subsequently recovered by the Inland Revenue Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The unassessed duty recovered by the Inland Revenue Department in the year 1905–6 amounted to £401,323.

Cost of Irish Police.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total cost in the last financial year of the Irish police, including the Dublin Metropolitan Police, and the rate per head of the Irish population as enumerated at the 1901 Census.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The net cost of the Royal Irish Constabulary for the year 1905–6, as borne upon the Votes, was £1,319,852, and the cost to local authorities was £22,908 (Belfast £20,347, Londonderry £1,134, Counties for extra police £1,427). The net cost of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, as borne upon the Votes (excluding £5,209, the average annual net cost of the Dublin Metropolitan Police Courts Establishment) was £102,131, and the cost to local authorities was £42,446. The total cost, therefore, was £1,487,337, namely £1,421,983 borne by the State and £65,354 by local authorities, and the total cost is equivalent to 6s. 8d. per head of the population as shown by the Census of 1901.

Irish School Teachers and Public Meetings.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the principal teacher of the Ballymote national school, county Sligo, was recently fined £5 by the Commissioners of National Education for making a speech at a meeting in connection with education at Ballaghadereen, county Sligo; and, if so, whether he will state the nature of the observations made by the teacher to which exception was taken by the Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they have fined this teacher £5 in respect of a speech made by him at Sligo, on October 27th, 1906, and have warned him that any repetition of such conduct would lead to his instant dismissal. The Commissioners have forwarded to me a newspaper report of the speech, from which it appears that the teacher imputed improper motives to the majority of the Commissioners and to many of their inspectors in regard to the dismissal of teachers for inefficiency.

Irish Education Grants.

Mr. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a Resolution passed by the general synod of the Church of Ireland, on 10th April, expressing the opinion that the Government should, by supplemental Estimate or otherwise, bring the grants for education in Ireland up to a level with those for England and Scotland; and whether he will press this matter upon the consideration of the Treasury.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My attention has been called to the Resolution referred to. The question of obtaining additional funds for primary education in Ireland is constantly before the Irish Government.

Arrears of Rent on the Blennerhassett Estate.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, although negotiations for the purchase of the Arthur Blennerhassett estate, near Killorglin, have been opened, a wholesale issue of civil bills for arrears of rent has been made; and whether, in view of the increase in the rents made since 1877, he will use his influence to have these proceedings stayed in order that purchase negotiations may be concluded.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that purchase agreements in respect of the Ballyseedy portion of this estate have been lodged with them, but that no proceedings in respect of the Killorglin portion of the estate have been instituted before them, and they have no knowledge of any negotiations for the purchase of that part of the estate which may be proceeding. I will ask the Commissioners to consider whether the case is one in which they might, with advantage, offer their services as conciliators under Section 8 of the Lord-Lieutenant's regulations.

Value of Volunteer Drill Halls and Ranges.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the estimated capital value of the buildings, drill halls, and ranges, belonging to the Volunteer forces.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The official Returns from the Volunteer corps on the 31st March, 1906 (the latest available), show the estimated value of the property as follows:—

	£
(a) Vested in Officer Commanding or his successors - -	1,080,000
(b) Vested in trustees, etc. - - -	92,000

The estimated value is in most cases based on the cost rather than the commercial value.

Transfer of Volunteer Liabilities from Public Works Loan Board to War Office.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he has obtained the consent of Volunteer regiments that their financial liabilities should be transferred from the Public Works Loan Commissioners to the War Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The consent of the Volunteer corps was not obtained because it was not in any way necessary. The mortgage deeds mortgage the property to the Public Works Loan Board or to its assignees.

Appointment to Postmastership of Birr.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether Mr. C. A. Simon, overseer, Southport, has been appointed postmaster of Birr; how many applications were received from Post Office officials serving in Ireland for this position; what is the length of Mr. Simon's service in the Post Office; what is the length of service of each of the unsuccessful applicants in Ireland; whether all, or nearly all, of the applicants in Ireland were possessed of proficiency certificates in postal and telegraph duties; and whether he will explain in what way

Mr. Simon's qualifications for this postmastership were superior to those of any, or of all, of the applicants in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Yes, Mr. C. A. Simon, overseer, Southport, has been appointed postmaster of Birr. In my Answer to the hon. Member's Question of 20th March I indicated my reasons for selecting Mr. Simon, and I have nothing to add to that Answer. It is not customary to publish particulars of the applications received.

Promotion of Irish Postal Officials.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state the length of service of each of the four Post Office officials in Ireland who during the year 1906 were promoted or transferred to postmasterships or salaried sub-postmasterships in Great Britain, the length of service of each of the two Post Office officials in Great Britain who during the year 1906 were promoted or transferred to similar posts in Ireland, and the annual salary or wages of each of the six immediately prior to and subsequent to such promotion or transfer.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is not usual to publish such particulars as those asked for by the hon. Member, nor do I see that any good purpose would be served by so doing.

Irish Postal Order Business.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that the British postal orders paid in Ireland amount approximately to less than 5 per cent. of the total orders paid there, and *vice versa*, and that it would be more economical to have all the details of Irish postal order work checked in Ireland, he will consider the advisability of issuing Irish orders with a separate series of numbers and a distinctive colour in the printing, and have all the details checked in Dublin instead of in London, as at present.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not able to confirm the figure given by the hon. Member, and I am not aware upon what he bases it. The issue of a separate series of postal orders for Ireland would considerably complicate the working of the system and interfere with its simplicity without securing any corresponding advantage.

Irish Postal Stores.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that the value of engineering stores used in Ireland in 1905 amounted to £11,500, of which only £500 was spent in Ireland, that nearly all the other Post Office stores used in Ireland are imported from Great Britain; that the upkeep of the Irish portion of the Post Office Savings Bank in London costs approximately £30,000 a year, that the Savings Bank deposits and withdrawals in Ireland made through British deposits books amount approximately to only 1 per cent. of the total and *vice versa*, and that the present system is inconvenient to Irish depositors and less economical from a public point of view, he will consider the advisability of transferring to Dublin the Irish Savings Bank work which is now done in London.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not able to confirm the hon. Member's figures so far as they relate to the Post Office Savings Bank. The question of transferring to Dublin the administration of the Irish business of the Savings Bank has been considered on several occasions, and it does not appear that there would be any economy in keeping the Irish Savings Bank accounts in Dublin. I may point out that any inconvenience that may be caused to Irish depositors by the present arrangement has been much diminished by the system of withdrawal on demand for sums not exceeding £1.

Postal Facilities in County Mayo.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that at Achill Sound and Mulrany Post Offices, County Mayo, there is only one post inwards and one outwards each weekday and none at all on Sundays, though at each there is a railway station, while at many smaller post offices in Mayo remote from railway stations there are two posts each way daily; that the limited mail train of the Midland Great Western Railway arrives at each of the stations, Achill Sound and Mulrany, daily, but carries no mails for them; and that the up limited mail leaves Achill Sound and Mulrany about mid-day and carries letters from more fortunate places to catch the evening mail boats from Dublin, but inhabitants of Achill Sound and Mulrany have to entrust their letters to the guard and ask him to post them when he reaches some place with better postal facilities; can he say why the mails from Achill and Mulrany are sent over 20 miles by road parallel to the railway on a one-horse car, although the railway has been open for traffic more than ten years; and will he endeavour to arrange more up-to-date postal facilities for Achill and Mulrany.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a report on this subject, and on its receipt I will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Great Southern and Western Railway—Examinations for Clerkships.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in the examinations for clerkships on the Great Southern and Western Railway one of three languages, Latin, French, or German, is compulsory; and whether, as these subjects are not included in the curriculum of national or primary schools, he will ask the directors whether they will consider the advisability of modifying this regulation, and also of including Irish as one of the subjects which may be taken.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) This is not a matter with which I can interfere.

King's Bench Division Clerkships—Open Competitions.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether steps can now be taken to fill future vacancies in King's Bench Division clerkships by open competition; and whether those at present exercising the patronage have any objections to such an arrangement.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The Lord Chancellor informs me that all appointments to junior clerkships in the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland are made by open competition, except in cases in which existing rights of patronage have been preserved by statute to certain judges. The Lord Chancellor has consulted the two judges who still possess these statutory rights, and they have informed him that they do not consider it expedient, and will not consent, to make the change suggested in the Question.

Irish Stone for New College of Science, Dublin.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether it has yet been decided that the new College of Science in Dublin will be constructed of Irish stone; whether he is aware that Irish stone, containing over 70 per cent. of silica and less than 2 per cent. of carbonate of lime, is available, whilst Portland stone contains only about 10 per cent. of silica and 80 per cent. of carbonate of lime, and that the Irish stone is free from flints and fossils; and whether, as the Irish stone is therefore better able to resist atmospheric changes and is more durable, he will see that it is used in the construction of the college.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer given by my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education to a similar Question on the 7th November last.†

Report of Committees on Employment of Domestics in the Navy and Ratings.

Mr. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state if the Departmental Committee that inquired into the question of the employment of domestics in the Royal Navy has concluded its labours; and when it is probable that the decision of their Lordships in reference thereto will be made known.

Mr. BRAMSDON: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state if the Ratings Committee appointed by their Lordships last year has yet made its Report; and when he hopes to make known such Committee's recommendations and their Lordships' decision thereon.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Both Reports have been received, but I am not at present in a position to state when it will be possible to promulgate the Admiralty decision.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxiv., 565.

Issue of Stokehold Boots.

MR. BRAMSDON: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state whether the stokehold boots have been found satisfactory in practice; and, whether it is possible for the issue to be made to each man personally annually, so as to avoid the unpleasant consequences which sometimes arise in the use of the boots by different men.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) These boots are not yet in general use, but they have been found quite satisfactory in the ships in which they have been tried. It has not been considered necessary so far to adopt the method of issue suggested by the hon. Member, and it is proposed to await further experience in the matter.

Children Emigrated to Canada.

MR. W. HOPE (Somersetshire, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of children emigrated to Canada by boards of guardians during 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) During the year 1906 the Local Government Board issued orders authorising expenditure by boards of guardians in respect of the emigration to Canada of 441 orphan or deserted children. Expenditure in respect of the emigration to Canada of 255 other children was authorised during the year by orders relating to the emigration of persons with their families.

Boarded-out Poor Law Children.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of Poor Law children boarded out within and beyond the union at the date of the last Return.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The most recent Return relates to 1st January last. On that date 6,806 children were boarded out within the union and 1,853 beyond the union.

Nottingham University College — Constitution of Court of Governors.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the President of the Board of Education what is the constitution of the Court of Governors of Nottingham University College; and whether the Board of Education approved of the constitution of this body before the charter was granted.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Charter provides that the Court of Governors shall consist of the President, the Vice-Presidents, and the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Nottingham acting by the City Council. The Answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

Rewards for Snake Killing in India.

MR. REES: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India still offers rewards for killing snakes; and, if so, whether, in view of the effect of such expenditure in encouraging professional snake charmers to breed poisonous snakes for the sake of the reward, and that any otherwise unexplained death is generally returned as due to snake bite by the village registrar, and in view of the efforts being made by the Government of India to discover an antidote against the snake venom, he will consider the propriety of inviting that Government to save the money spent upon such rewards.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) Rewards for the destruction of snakes are not offered by the Government of India, but local Governments are authorised to offer them to such extent as they think fit. As the total amount thus spent from Government funds throughout India does not usually exceed £200 per annum, I do not think there is any occasion to interfere with this discretionary power.

Irish Evicted Tenants — Case of Mrs. E. Crawford of Mullaghgarrow.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if the Estates Commissioners have received a claim from Mrs. Eliza Crawford, of Mullaghgarrow, county Fermanagh, an evicted tenant, for restoration or provision of a new holding; and whether the Commissioners have yet made any decision on her claim.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The application referred to was only received by the Estates Commissioners on the 3rd instant. No decision has yet been made in the matter.

Irish Loan Fund Board Auditors.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Loan Fund Board of Ireland has been called to the fact that some of the loan societies have appointed relatives of directors as auditors; and whether, with a view to checking abuses, some qualification for auditors can be insisted upon, as well as the publication in a local newspaper of the annual statement of accounts.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Loan Fund Board are not aware that any loan fund society certified under 6 and 7 Vic., cap. 91, has appointed relatives of directors or any other persons as auditors. The only official having power to audit the accounts of such societies is the Loan Fund inspector appointed under the statute referred to.

Condition of Road from Parkmore to Red Bay.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the condition of the road from Parkmore to Red Bay, county Antrim; whether he is aware that the Midland Railway Company ascribe the failure to provide adequate motor connection with the railway to the bad condition of this road; whether the damage to the roadway is done by traction engines, the owners of which pay nothing to the repair or upkeep of the roads; whether he can state the annual cost of keeping this road in repair; and whether, having regard to the effect upon the development of Red Bay and Cushendall, the Local Government Board will say what steps, if any, can be taken to make the owners of the traction engines liable for the damage done to the roads.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board inform me that the road in question has at times been in bad condition owing to the destructive traffic in iron ore from the Parkmore Mines to Red Bay Pier. This traffic is carried on partly by traction engines and partly by farmers' carts, the owners of which contribute nothing towards the cost, about £815 per annum, of maintaining the road beyond their ordinary contribution as ratepayers. As the law at present stands in Ireland, owners of traction engines cannot be made liable for damage done to roads. I have no information as to the second portion of the Question.

School Fees in Irish Model Schools.

Mr. T. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, what amount of money was paid in school fees through the central model schools in Dublin in the past year; how much was refunded to the teachers of these schools, and how the balance of the amount was distributed; and whether such distribution was by direction of the Treasury or the National Board of Education.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) School fees amounting to £257 19s. 10d. were received from the pupils attending the central model schools during the year ended 31st December, 1906. The entire amount of school fees received from the pupils of the Board's model schools during the year 1906 was distributed amongst the model school teachers according to rules sanctioned by the Treasury. These rules are set forth in the reply given to the Question of the hon. Member for South Belfast on 21st March, 1906.† The shares of the teachers of the central model schools for the year 1906 amounted in the aggregate to £136 18s. 3d.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Rosyth.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether there is any intention of making an increase, in the near future, in the staff of men working at Rosyth dock, which now consists of nine men.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 356.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that from John o' Groats to Dover there is no dock able to take battleships of the "Dreadnought" class, he will consider the urgency of constructing a suitable dock at Rosyth without delay.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): A statement on the subject of both these Questions will be made in the course of the debate on Vote 10, which I anticipate will be taken at an early date.

Officers appointed from the Ranks.

MAJOR RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many officers were appointed from the ranks from 1st January, 1898, to 1st January, 1903, not including riding masters and quartermasters; and how many of these officers were serving in the Regular Army on 1st January, 1907.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The number of officers appointed from the ranks (exclusive of quartermasters and riding masters) to the Cavalry, Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, Infantry and Army Service Corps from 1st January, 1898, to 31st December, 1902, was 136, and the number serving on the 1st January, 1907, was 86.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Do these figures include district officers of the Royal Artillery, and officers of the Coast Brigade Royal Engineers?

MR. HALDANE asked for notice of the Question.

Appointments of Officers.

MAJOR RENTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many officers were appointed from 1st January, 1898, to 1st January, 1903, not including riding masters and quartermasters; and how many of these officers were serving in the Regular Army on 1st January, 1907.

MR. HALDANE: The number of officers (exclusive of quartermasters and riding masters) appointed to the Cavalry, Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, Infantry and Army Service Corps, including those appointed from the ranks, from the 1st January, 1898, to 31st December, 1902, was 6,082 and the number serving on 1st January, 1907, was 4,091.

Under-Age Recruits.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of a soldier named Henry Hartney, No. 8,404, G Company, 2nd Battalion Royal Munster Fusiliers, who was born on the 13th July, 1889, and enlisted before he was seventeen years of age, and to the fact that his widowed mother has claimed him on account of being under age, and has sent his baptismal certificate to the commanding officer when claiming his discharge; will he say what is the legal age for enlistment in the Regular Army; and whether, under the circumstances, this boy will be discharged and handed over to his mother.

MR. HALDANE: The age for enlistment in the Regular Forces is eighteen. The circumstances under which any individual having mis-stated his age on enlistment can obtain discharge are fully set forth in paragraph 1805 King's Regulations. The power of deciding these cases is vested in the local military authorities, with whose discretion I am not prepared to interfere.

MR. JOYCE: If the limit of age is eighteen and the baptismal lines of the recruit enlisted show that he is under seventeen, has the boy's parent or guardian power to secure his discharge?

MR. HALDANE. When the recruit is very young we do not hold him by his act, but when he is nearly the age we give certain powers of discretion to the commanding officer to say whether or not he shall be released.

MR. JOYCE: But why take advantage of fraud committed by persons who are considered infants by the law?

MR. HALDANE: It is not a case of taking advantage of fraud at all. It is not right that a youth should be enlisted at his own request, and then when he finds he does not like it claim his discharge on a technicality.

Mr. JOYCE: Will the right hon. Gentleman recommend the military authorities to discharge this boy and send him home to his widowed mother?

[No Answer was returned.]

Volunteer Drill Halls and Rifle Ranges.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can give a general estimate of the total amount of capital liability incurred by Volunteer regiments in providing drill halls and rifle ranges; and what proportion of that liability had been paid off.

Mr. HALDANE: A general estimate of this amount may be formed from the following figures. In the Returns furnished by Volunteer Corps on the 31st March 1906 (the latest available) the estimated value of the property was as follows:—(*a*) Vested in officers commanding and successors £1,080,00; (*b*) vested in trustees, etc. £92,000. Of this some £65,000 was contributed by the Government in aid of rifle ranges. On that date there were mortgages on this property outstanding as follows:—(*a*) £526,000; (*b*) £17,000. The estimated value is in most cases based on the cost rather than on the commercial value, and I cannot pledge myself to the accuracy of the figures.

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.

Mr. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will suspend the further discharge of men from Woolwich Arsenal until the Committee of Inquiry which has been appointed has reported.

Mr. HALDANE: I am afraid that it would not be practicable to adopt the suggestion put forward by my hon. friend. It will be imperative to carry out some discharges, and, while every endeavour is being made to reduce the number as much as possible, complete suspension of discharges could not be conceded.

Mr. ROWLANDS: Will the right hon. Gentleman hurry the inquiry?

Mr. HALDANE: It is being pushed on as rapidly as possible.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman put down the Vote for the Ordnance Department prior to the discharge of these men, so that the House may have an opportunity of discussing the whole question?

Mr. HALDANE: That Question should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Bombay Municipal Elections.

Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to a letter addressed to the Bombay Government by three members of the Legislative Council, complaining of the interference by the commissioner of police and other officials in the Bombay municipal elections; and whether, looking to the Government of India Orders of 12th June 1902, which declare that officers of Government interfering with the free choice of elective bodies will be severely dealt with, and to the fact that the Bombay Government has declined to take action, he will cause inquiry to be made into the complaint of the three honourable members of Council.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs): The letter to which the hon. Member refers has been privately brought to my notice. Officials are not prohibited from offering themselves as candidates at municipal elections, and if they do, it is obvious that they must canvass; but I am confident that if any instance is brought to the notice of the Government of Bombay in which a candidate has made improper use of his official position to influence votes, they will act entirely in the spirit of Lord Curzon's letter of 1902.

Lord Kitchener's Command.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether Lord Kitchener has been offered and accepted an extension of his term as Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for India whether Lord Kitchener has been offered and has accepted an extension of his period of service as Commander-in-Chief in India.

MR. MORLEY: The duty of recommending for the office of Commander-in-Chief belongs to my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War. With the approval of my right hon. friend I addressed a preliminary inquiry to Lord Kitchener whether a further extension for two years would be agreeable to him, and expressing my own wish that he should accept. He has replied in the affirmative. My right hon. friend will take the proper steps in due course.

Mayo College.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether boys receiving their education at the Mayo College are to a great extent financed by the Imperial Government; and, if so, whether in regard to boys of the class concerned, there is any sufficient reason why they should be assisted from the public purse.

MR. MORLEY: The Government of India give an annual grant to the Mayo College, the cost of the foundation of which was met partly by contributions from the Rajputana Chiefs, partly by a Government grant. The attention of the Government of India has been called to the question of charging fees.

Australian State Premiers and the Colonial Conference.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will lay upon the Table the correspondence relating to the exclusion of the State Premiers of Australia from the Colonial Conference.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I refer the hon. and gallant Member to the correspondence printed in Cd. 3340.

SIR. WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): Is the correspondence complete?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to reply in the affirmative.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): Are we on this side in possession of all the correspondence published in Australia in connection with this matter?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know, but if there has been any correspondence published in Australia and not yet published here and my attention is drawn to it, the documents shall be laid before the House.

Orange River Colony Constitution.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state what has occurred to delay the issue of the Letters Patent embodying the provisions of the Constitution for the Orange River Colony; whether a register of voters has been formed and a Boundary Commission appointed, as declared in his speech made in this House on the 17th December last;† and whether he adheres to the belief then expressed by him that the new Parliament of the Colony might assemble in Bloemfontein some time during the coming autumn.

MR. CHURCHILL: The preparation of the Letters Patent is being pressed on and they will issue in the course of the next few weeks. Thereupon the registration of voters and delimitation of constituencies for which all is in readiness will proceed. No change either in point of time or method has taken place in the policy of His Majesty's Government upon the Constitution of the Orange River Colony; and no delay that was not expected last December has occurred. I see no reason to doubt that the new Parliament of the Colony will assemble in Bloemfontein in the autumn according to the anticipation which I then expressed to the House.

Judicial Powers in Nairobi.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what punishment is the magistrate at Nairobi empowered to inflict on natives for insulting white women; and, in view of recent occurrences, is it proposed to add to his powers.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxvii., 1078.

MR. CHURCHILL: Under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, which is in force in the East Africa Protectorate, an insult to the modesty of a women is punishable with imprisonment for one year and with a fine. The law, of course, applies irrespective of the colour or race of the offender. The Secretary of State is not aware that any offences against this law have recently occurred, and he does not see any reason to increase the penalty.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) asked whether the alleged insult to a white women by natives consisted of language, gesture, or anything approaching personal insult or personal outrage?

MR. CHURCHILL said that from the information telegraphed the Secretary of State formed the impression that nothing in the nature of an insult to the modesty of the lady in question took place, but for the complete particulars they must wait until the account by mail arrived.

SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether prior to the occurrences which led to the imprisonment of Captain Grogan and others, the Colonial Office had received any representation from the Colonists' Association at Nairobi, alleging that the local authorities are powerless or unwilling to deal effectively with cases in which the white population are exposed to insult or danger from the coloured inhabitants; and, if so, what is the date of such representation, and what reply was sent to it.

MR. CHURCHILL: The only representation of the kind which has been received at the Colonial Office is in the address of the Colonists' Association to the then Secretary of State, dated the 23rd of August, 1905, in which representations were made as to the alleged danger of a native rebellion and it was recommended that white troops and police should be substituted for the existing native forces. In replying to this address the present Secretary of State, while welcoming the assistance of the white colonists in maintaining order and trusting that they would render such assistance by joining the Volunteer Reserve, expressed the opinion that the general substitution of white troops and police was impossible not only on account of their greater cost but also because at least they would be less suited to operations in the tropical parts of the Protectorate. At the same time the Secretary of State expressed his conviction that just treatment of the natives was the surest safeguard of the settlers, and that, if this were accorded, the settlers would have no cause to fear them.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Was the memorial referred to the same as the joint petition to this House?

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot say until I have had an opportunity of perusing the documents.

Jamaica.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can make any statement in regard to the application for loan and grant to Jamaica.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): At the same time, may I ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now in a position to state what requests for the provision of financial assistance have been received by the Government from the Jamaican representatives now in England; and what assistance by grant or loan the Government propose to give.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has only during the last day or two had an opportunity of listening to the statement of the Archbishop of Jamaica, who has introduced a deputation from the Colony. The consideration of the case is not yet concluded.

Opium Traffic in Ceylon.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Singhalese people grew the poppy in Ceylon or used opium under their native kings, or during the Portuguese or Dutch rule, or until the middle of last century, when the British Government established licensed shops for the sale of opium in towns and villages; and whether, seeing that the importation of opium has increased from 1,000 lbs. in 1850 to 20,000 lbs. in 1905, and that the

Buddhist High Priest, Sumangala, and the Singhalese representative on the Legislative Council, Mr. Obeyesekera, have appealed to the Government to close the licensed shops, His Majesty's Government will take steps to suppress the opium traffic in Ceylon.

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot undertake at this moment to dispute nor to confirm the facts which the hon. Member has assembled; but the increase of the imports of opium into Ceylon under British rule has already formed the subject of official inquiry and correspondence, and is engaging the serious attention of the Secretary of State.

Persian Customs Control.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has information to the effect that the Belgian Directors of Customs in Persia have been dismissed; and whether, if any fresh appointments of the like character are contemplated, he will endeavour to arrange that directors acceptable to this country and favourable to the development of its commerce are appointed in the Persian Gulf.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): The Minister of Customs in Persia, Monsieur Naus, and his Assistant, Monsieur Priem, have resigned. My right hon. friend has no information of the resignation or dismissal of any of the other Belgian Customs Officials in Persia, or of any contemplated change in the Belgian staff in the ports of the Persian Gulf.

Turkish Customs.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Porte have yet been notified of the formal assent of Great Britain to the three per cent. increase in the Turkish Customs.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Answer is in the negative.

Duty on Chocolate.

SIR WILLIAM BULL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the extent to which manufactured chocolate is imported into this country; what is the amount derived by the Exchequer as the result of the protective duty; and whether he has any information as to the advantage such protective duty has been to British manufacturers.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. ASQUITH): Taking the figures for the five years from 1902 to 1906 inclusive, the average annual import into the United Kingdom of cocoa or chocolate ground, prepared, or in any way manufactured, and confectionery containing chocolate, has been 10,914,000 lbs., of which the average quantity entered for home consumption has been 10,307,000 lbs. The average total amount of duty received thereon was £85,340; but I am not prepared to say what proportion (if any) of this receipt results from the alleged protective character of the rates of duty, or to make an estimate of any advantage which may accrue to British manufacturers by reason of those rates.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked whether it was not a fact that the duty payable on raw cocoa was from 2s. 3d. to 8s. 6d. per cwt. less than the duty charged on the product of the same quantity of raw material imported in the manufactured form.

MR. RUNCIMAN said if that the right hon. Gentleman would put his Question on the Paper he would have the figures verified.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN further asked whether there could not be presented to the House the calculations on this subject made by the Chairman of the Board of Customs in October, 1904, for the information of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. RUNCIMAN replied that he would be glad to communicate this desire to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Financial Statements.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in presenting to the House the printed financial statement for 1907–8, in continuation of Paper 147 of Session 1906, he can see his way to exhibit the respective items of our Imperial revenue and expenditure in such manner that, while they make the facts clear as to the gross income and outgo of the postal and telegraph business, the gross figures of those businesses are not brought into the totals to make it appear that the national expenditure is much larger than is actually the case.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The rearrangement which my hon. friend suggests would not be a very convenient one, regard being had to the general form of the public accounts. Anyone wishing to readjust the figures in the manner suggested can readily do so upon the material furnished by the Return in its present form.

Death Duties.

CAPTAIN WARING (Banffshire): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Inland Revenue authorities have applied for the payment of Death Duties in cases where no duty was exigible, thereby putting unnecessary expense on trustees or executors in resisting these claims; and, if so, whether provision could be made for recouping trustees, executors, or others for any expense to which they may have been put in connection with such claims when ill-founded.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Such cases may sometimes occur with this or any other tax. But my information is that they are rare; and it does not seem to me to be desirable that any general provision should be made for conferring on trustees or others a title to claim reimbursement of expenses incurred in consequence. Where there are special circumstances the Board of Inland Revenue are ready to consider them.

Buxton Brewster Sessions.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at the Buxton brewster sessions on 9th February, when a provisional full licence for the sale of intoxicating liquors was granted to the secretary of the Buxton Garden Company, Limited, in respect of a building known as the Old Theatre; whether he is aware that the grant was made by a narrow majority of the justices, in the face of opposition from Buxton residents, including property owners and licensed victuallers; that certain of the justices voting for the grant were until recently shareholders in the Buxton Garden Company, Limited; whether the justices declared that there was no monopoly value in the licence for which payment should be made by the applicant; whether the chairman of the bench on this occasion ceased to be a member of the company the day before he adjudicated, having transferred his 127 shares in the company to the magistrates' clerk who acted as magistrates' clerk while the case was heard; whether another of the justices acting also ceased to be a member of the company the day before the application was heard, having transferred into the name of his wife the twenty-one shares he held in the company; whether these justices had taken part in the meeting of shareholders of the company at which the question of applying for a licence was discussed, and the chairman had, before the application was made, pronounced strongly in public in favour of the grant of the licence; and whether, under these circumstances, he will take steps to prevent the confirmation of the licence.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): The Secretary of State asks me to say that he has no information as to this case, but he will make inquiries into the allegations contained in the Question. It cannot, however, in any event lie with him to take any action in regard to the confirmation of the licence. It is open to any person who opposed the grant and to no other person to oppose the confirmation.

*MR. LEIF JONES: If the statements in the Question are confirmed by the inquiries, will the attention of the Lord Chancellor be drawn to the action of these justices, who evidently formed a biassed tribunal?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: We must await the result of the inquiries before deciding upon the policy to be pursued.

Railway Company's Contributions to the London Municipal Society.

MR. TREVELYAN (York, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that the London and South Western Railway Company assisted in financing the London Municipal Society; whether he will make an inquiry into the extent and circumstances of the subscription; and whether he has yet decided what steps to take, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent the recurrence of subscriptions by companies created by Act of Parliament to associations which take an active part in contested elections.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I have received the following letter from the London and South Western Railway Company:—

"London and South Western Railway,
"General Manager's Office,
"Waterloo Station,
"London, S.E.
"12th April, 1907.

"Sir,

"With reference to your letter of the 9th instant, and to the question which Mr. Trevelyan proposes to ask the President of the Board of Trade in the House of Commons on Monday next the 15th instant, I would explain that this Company did contribute to the funds of the London Municipal Society in July, 1906, the sum of £100.

"In so doing, the Directors acted under the belief that the Municipal Reform movement was not connected in any way with Party, and entirely in the desire to assist a society whose object was to reduce the rates, which pressed very severely on railway companies, who are in the anomalous position of not having any voice in the election of those who make the rates.

"This Company has never subscribed to any association having a political object, and does not propose to do so.

"In order to show you the anxiety of the Directors to avoid, as far as possible, any political influence being exercised among their employees, or on their premises, I take the opportunity of sending you copy of a letter which was circulated prior to the last general election—following the course frequently adopted on previous occasions.

"I am, Sir,
"Your obedient Servant,
"CHARLES J. OWENS.

"The Assistant Secretary,
"(Railway Department),
"Board of Trade,
"7, Whitehall Gardens, S.W."

With regard to the last part of my hon. friend's Question, I am not yet in a position to make any statement, but the matter is receiving the careful attention of His Majesty's Government.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman read the other letter? [Cries of "No, no."]

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked whether in view of these disclosures and others of a similar nature, the right hon. Gentleman would consult with the Prime Minister with a view to annulling the recent London County Council election.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) asked whether it would be competent for a shipping company to give a subscription to a political Party which included shipping subsidies in their programme.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a purely hypothetical question.

Redditch Signalman's Duty.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade how many hours the signalman, John Canning, worked at Redditch on 1st April; how many trains passed his signal-box from the time he went on duty to the time he left; whether he received any assistance; what time was allowed for his meals; was he permitted to leave his box during the day; what wages he earned whilst on duty; and whether any allowance is made by the railway company to his wife during the illness of John Canning brought about by the strain of work.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am informed by the Midland Railway Company that the signalman in question was not on duty on the 1st April. He was on duty from 8 p.m. on Saturday the 30th March until 7 a.m. on the following morning, his usual Saturday night turn of duty, during which time twenty-four trains passed his cabin. No assistance was given during this period, nor could he leave his post, but there were ample intervals for meals between trains. This signalman is paid 23s. a week wages with an annual bonus of 50s. and during absence from duty through illness he receives 12s. a week from the Midland Railway Friendly Society to which the company contribute.

Merchant Shipping Bill.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if it is his intention to deal with the Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill as if it were a Private Bill, necessitating appearance by counsel and agents of those opposed to the measure; and if he is aware that this will entail great expense on the opponents of the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The matter to which my hon. friend refers is having my careful consideration in all its bearings, and I have asked gentlemen representative of the interests concerned to confer with me with regard to it. At the moment I am not in a position to make any definite statement as to the procedure I shall recommend to the House.

London Brighton and South Coast Railway—Lighting of Trains.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a second class carriage of the train leaving Pulborough at 12.3 p.m. on the 18th March was not lighted when passing through tunnels between that station and Victoria; and seeing that frequent complaints are made that the carriages of trains running between Pulborough and Victoria are not lighted during their passage through the tunnels, will he communicate with the railway company on the subject.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have communicated with the railway company in this matter and will inform my hon. friend of the result.

Imports of Dutiable Articles.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the value in 1906 of the total imports into the United Kingdom of all articles upon which revenue duties are now imposed from each of the self-governing Colonies.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The total value of dutiable articles imported from each of the self-governing Colonies in 1906 was as follows:—Cape of Good Hope, £12,677; Natal, £4,187; Transvaal, £30; Australian Commonwealth, £106,537; New Zealand, £163; Canada, £15,368; Newfoundland and the Coast of Labrador, £289. These figures are classified according to the Colony from which the goods were consigned to the United Kingdom.

Lighting of the Devon and Cornish Coasts.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the recent wrecks of the "Suevic" and the "Jebba" off the Devon and Cornish coasts, he will cause inquiry to be made into the sufficiency of the lighting arrangements in that neighbourhood with a view to the increased protection of shipping against disaster.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Any inquiry into the sufficiency of the lighting arrangements of the coasts of Devon and Cornwall would be a matter for the consideration of the Trinity House as the General Lighthouse Authority for England and Wales, and the Elder Brethren, whom I have consulted regarding the hon. Member's Question, inform me that in their opinion it would be premature and possibly prejudicial for them to express any opinion on the subject pending the formal investigations which will shortly be held into the casualties to the "Suevic" and "Jebba."

The Patents and Designs Bill.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will cause to be printed and circulated, before the Second Reading of the Patents Bill, a memorandum, similar to the memoranda circulated on other Government Bills this session, showing its effect on existing legislation.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have already made arrangements for a memorandum of the kind described by the noble Lord to be printed and circulated before the Second Reading of the Patents and Designs Bill.

Vaccination in Workhouses.

*Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if it is a practice for medical officers of workhouses to vaccinate every person entering those institutions at all ages, varying from three days up to eighty years; and what was the cost of vaccinations performed in workhouses during the year 1906.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): So far as I am aware, there is no such practice as is referred to in the first part of the Question. The cost of vaccination in workhouses is not shown separately in the Returns, and I am not able to state what it is.

Mr. LUPTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry as to the practice?

[No Answer was returned.]

Primary Vaccination.

*Mr. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if the Local Government Board Order of the 18th October, 1898, Third Schedule, Section No. 7, which states that in all ordinary cases of primary vaccination the public vaccinator must aim at producing four separate good-sized vesicles or groups of vesicles not less than half an inch from one another, and that the total area of vesiculation resulting from the vaccination should not be less than half a square inch, is still in force, or have the medical advisers of the Local Government Board come to the conclusion that there is no advantage in large vesiculation; and, if so, will he issue a fresh Order.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The instruction in the Order is still in force, and the medical advisers of the Local Government Board do not recommend that it should be altered. They have not come to any conclusions in this matter opposed to the views expressed in paragraphs 294, 295 and 297 of the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Vaccination.

*Mr. LUPTON: Is it not the fact that Dr. Copeland of the Local Government Board has stated that the formation of large marks or any marks is not essential to good vaccination, and that the marks are caused by organisms other than the vaccine microbe.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I must not be held responsible for any medical opinion.

Kettering Urban Council and Phthisis.

Sir F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has now received and considered the statement of the Kettering Urban Council and the Report of their medical officer in support of their resolution, under Section 7 of The Infectious Disease (Notification) Act, 1889, to apply that Act to phthisis; whether he is aware that this resolution was moved by a direct representative of labour, has the general assent of the working class in Kettering, and was passed unanimously by the council; whether he is aware that throughout the shoemaking towns the spread of the disease in the factories is specially dreaded, and that, while the sanitary arrangements of Kettering have reduced the deaths in Kettering from zymotic diseases to ·25 per thousand, there is an average of forty-nine deaths per annum from phthisis, or a mortality of 1·28 per thousand; and whether, having regard to these facts, he will now signify his approval of the resolution and allow compulsory notification of phthisis in this urban district area.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I have received the statement of the District Council and the Report of the medical officer of health referred to. They have only reached me within the last few days, and they are now under consideration.

Compulsory Notification of Phthisis.

Sir F. CHANNING: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has obtained authoritative Reports of the working of the compulsory notification of phthisis, under the provisions of private Acts, in the county boroughs of Bolton and Sheffield; whether such Reports show the system to be working satisfactorily and without serious objection; whether he has obtained, from or through the Local Government Board for Scotland, Reports as to the working of compulsory notification of phthisis in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other Scottish towns in pursuance of orders approved by that Board on the express ground that phthisis is now regarded as infectious; and whether such Reports show that this system is working satisfactorily and without serious objection.

MR. JOHN BURNS: There have been statements in the Annual Reports of the Bolton and Sheffield medical officers of health on this subject, but I am not aware that any authoritative Reports have otherwise been made with regard to it. Nor have I received any Report from or through the Scottish Local Government Board as to the working of compulsory notification of phthisis in any towns in Scotland. Dr. Bulstrode, one of the Medical Inspectors of the Local Government Board, has, however, for some time past been engaged on an inquiry as to phthisis sanatoria in England and Wales, and incidentally he has acquired much information as to the working both of voluntary and of compulsory notification of pulmonary phthisis. This information he is embodying in a Report which is now in the Press.

Inspection of Dairies.

MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what was the number of the local authorities to which the tuberculosis circular of the Board of 11th March, 1899, adverting to the Report of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis, and enclosing copies of model regulations for the control and inspection of dairies, was sent; and how many of such authorities have since made regulations or revised existing regulations in accordance with the views expressed by the Board in the circular.

I beg also to ask the President of the Local Government Board, in view of the possible danger to the public from the sale of tuberculous milk, if the Local Government Board have any power to compel a local authority, within the meaning of the Dairy, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Order of 1885, to make regulations for the inspection of cattle in dairies contemplated by Article 13 of the Order; and if there are any, and if so, how many, local authorities in England and Wales which up to the present have made no such regulations.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have no power to compel the making of regulations under Article 13 of the Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Order, but regulations under the Article are in force in all except about 340 out of some 1,800 urban and rural districts. The precise figures will appear in a Return now in preparation which was moved for by my hon. friend the Member for the Brentford Division. The regulations usually contain an article as to the inspection of cattle in dairies. The Circular of 11th March, 1899, was sent to the councils of all urban and rural districts. Regulations under the Order have since been made by 906 of these councils, and they have generally been based on the model regulations issued by the Local Government Board.

Slaughtering of Animals.

*MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if the Government will bring in legislation in order to carry out the unanimous recommendations of the Committee appointed by the Admiralty in 1904 to consider the humane slaughtering of animals.

MR. JOHN BURNS: My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. I will give consideration to the subject, but I cannot promise to introduce legislation with regard to it during the present session.

*MR. G. GREENWOOD: Will the Government give facilities for the Bill which has passed its Second Reading in another place, with the support of the President of the Board of Agriculture, to enable public authorities to establish public slaughter-houses?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will consider that.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): If the right hon. Gentleman in view of the state of public business, feels it impossible to introduce legislation dealing with this subject, will he consider the desirability of issuing a circular to local bodies calling attention to the unanimous recommendations of this Committee, and of doing what he can by means of Departmental regulations?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I shall be pleased to consider that suggestion sympathetically, knowing that the hon. Gentleman has taken special interest in this matter. May I add that the Report with which his name is associated, has advanced the subject very much more than he may be disposed to think?

Canadian Postage Rates Reduction.

SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the arrangement that he has been negotiating with the Dominion Government with reference to the postage on newspapers, magazines, and trade journals from this country to Canada has been brought to a conclusion; and if he can state what is the nature of the arrangement.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I am glad to say that I have been able to come to an arrangement with Mr. Lemieux, the Dominion Postmaster-General, by which the postage rates on newspapers, magazines, and trade journals going to Canada will be very materially reduced. Perhaps I need not trouble the House with the details of the arrangement, as a statement in regard to the matter will appear to-morrow morning. Substantially the effect of the arrangement is this: The present postal rate on the articles in question is approximately 4d. per pound, which will be reduced to 1d. per pound per packet. But a very substantial portion of the loss involved by the reduction of 3d. per pound will be borne by the Dominion Post Office and only a portion will therefore fall upon the British Post Office. The Dominion Government will relieve the British Post Office, and themselves bear the cost of ocean transit on the articles in question in ships under contract with Canada. This represents a relief to us, in respect of the matter conveyed on those ships, of a little over 2d. per pound. The arrangement just concluded will put this country in future in a more favourable postal position towards Canada in respect of newspapers, magazines, and trade journals than that occupied by any other country. We are sanguine that the reduction thus given, and the improved postal facilities granted, will lead to increased postal communications, and to the circulation on a large scale of British newspapers, magazines, and trade journals in Canada. I desire to state emphatically, however, that this particular postal concession is based partly on the consideration of the very special and peculiar position, geographical and otherwise, occupied by Canada, the result of which is that British newspapers, magazines, etc., have been unable to obtain a footing in Canada, and do not reach the Canadian citizen, and partly in consideration of the very material contribution to the cost made by Canada herself. This concession must not in any way be held to form a precedent for a reduction in other cases where similar conditions do not prevail. The arrangement, being experimental, is limited at first to four years. I hope to be able to bring the new rates into force on 1st May.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether trade catalogues and circulars will be included in the reduced rates? May I offer my congratulations to the right hon. Gentleman upon having arrived at this arrangement?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Perhaps it will be better if the right hon. Gentleman will wait to see the regulations about to be issued.

Woodlands St. Mary Post Office.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is the intention of the postal authorities to order the removal of the Woodlands St. Mary post office, in South Berks, from the central position it now occupies to a position on the extreme edge of the parish, which will involve many of the inhabitants walking upwards of two miles to reach it; and, if so, what are the reasons for the proposed change, and what steps will be taken to meet the inconvenience imposed upon the inhabitants, especially in regard to parcels and postal orders, by the proposed change.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: As I have explained to the hon. Member by letter in full detail, I believe that the proposed arrangements will be for the general convenience of the district.

Coigach (Ross-shire) Letter Deliveries.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received a petition from the inhabitants of the Coigach district, Achiltibuie, Ross-shire, urging that there should be a daily delivery of letters during the six months of the year from May to October; and will efforts be made to accede to the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have received the petition referred to by the hon. Member, and I find that there is already a service on six days a week from Ullapool to Achiltibuie in the months of July, August and September. I regret that, owing to the high cost of the existing arrangements compared to the receipts, I should not be justified in affording, during the other three months, a more frequent service than that now given on three days a week. It is possible, however, that a delivery on six days would be justified in some part of the district served from Achiltibuie during the three summer months. I am making further inquiry on this point and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Endowments for Secondary Education.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he would grant a Return showing the endowments available for secondary education which, under Part II. of the Education Bill of 1906, would not have been placed under public control, and also showing the amount of the endowments for national education which is now expended on the upkeep, including cost of buildings, of Eton, Winchester, and Harrow.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The Board of Education do not possess, and I do not think there is in existence, any authentic comprehensive list of endowments available in England and Wales for secondary education, whether those that would have been or those that would not have been exempt under Part II. of last year's Bill. I am, therefore, unable to give the information desired in the first paragraph of the Question, but the Board are making endeavours gradually to compile a list of such endowments. This will, however, be a long and laborious process. As regards the second paragraph, I will direct that a statement shall be furnished to the hon. Member giving, so far as is practicable, the information he desires in respect of that one of the three schools named in the Question, viz., Harrow, about which the Board possess information.

Elementary School Return.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will issue a Return for 1906, similar to that made in 1900 [Cd. 315], showing, for each public elementary school inspected in England and Wales, the name and denomination of school, the accommodation, the average attendance, the annual grant paid, and particulars of school income and expenditure; and if he cannot give the Return for England will he give it for Wales only.

MR. MCKENNA: All the information which my hon. friend requires, with the exception of the Annual Grant paid and the particulars of school income and expenditure, will be found in the List of Public Elementary Schools in England and Wales on 1st January, 1906, issued by the Board of Education [Cd. 3182]. The grants are no longer paid to managers responsible for individual schools, but to local education authorities, and are not earmarked as sums to be spent upon the particular schools in respect of which they are paid. Moreover, the expenditure upon each individual school is not separated in the accounts of most authorities. I doubt, therefore, whether it would be possible to obtain the information in respect of either England or Wales, and I am certain the results would not justify the very large expenditure involved. I must also point out to my hon. friend that the conditions under which the Return was granted in 1900 have entirely changed owing to the passing of the Education Act, 1902.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Have the Department no official information as to the application of the rates to various schools?

MR. MCKENNA: The information could be supplied in some cases but not in others.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House any information as to those local authorities which do not make any payment out of the rates towards the support of schools?

MR. MCKENNA: No doubt the information could be obtained, but it would take a very long time.

LORD R. CECIL: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the possibility of getting it?

MR. MCKENNA: Yes.

Royston School Teachership.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he can state the exact educational grounds on which Mr. Milnes, formerly in the employ of the West Riding County Council, was rejected as a candidate for a teachership at Royston.

MR. MCKENNA: The jurisdiction of the Board of Education in this and similar cases is strictly limited to determining whether the local education authority withheld their consent on educational grounds. These grounds in the present case are of course within the knowledge of the Board, but it seems unnecessary and, in the interests of the teacher, undesirable to state publicly the precise educational reasons on which the local education authority grounded their decision that Mr. Milnes was unsuited for the post.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: The right hon. Gentleman the other day stated that he was aware of the grounds.

MR. MCKENNA: I have the grounds, and if the noble Lord wishes I will state them, but I think it undesirable.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: If I ask for them privately can I have them?

MR. MCKENNA: Oh, yes.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): Did I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say the Board had no jurisdiction if the grounds were educational?

MR. MCKENNA: If educational grounds are alleged for the decision, and the Board are satisfied that the grounds are really educational, the Board has no further jurisdiction.

MR. LANE-FOX: Did the Board take any steps to inquire if the grounds were really educational?

MR. MCKENNA: Yes.

MR. LANE-FOX: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the ground on which the appointment was refused was absolutely inadequate and was based on entirely different——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is asking a number of Questions of some of which notice should be given.

Sharlston School.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the Board's inspector reported favourably or otherwise on the Sharlston elementary school during Mr. Milnes' tenure of the mastership.

MR. MCKENNA: The reports on the teaching at the Sharlston school during Mr. Milnes' tenure of the head teachership have been satisfactory.

National Physical Laboratory.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Tamworth Division of Warwickshire, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will give a detailed Return of the receipts and expenditure of the National Physical Laboratory since its establishment; and if he will give instructions for a detailed balance sheet to be published annually in a form available to the Members of the House as distinct from the particulars at present published.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have, with the consent of the Royal Society, directed that the accounts of the Laboratory since 1900 shall be laid forthwith, and that in future a copy of the accounts shall be laid annually.

British Museum Reading Room.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the closing of the reading room of the British Museum for six months for repainting, and of the fact that on foggy days books only actually inside the reading room are available because the rest of the galleries are not artificially lit, and as in winter the hours of the distribution of books from other parts of the building are necessarily very restricted, he will consider the desirability of lighting the other parts of the library by electricity.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am informed that during the closing of the reading room the books on the shelves of the room have been removed from thence and are available for the readers, who are temporarily accommodated in other rooms of the library. It is not proposed to alter the present system of supply of books from other parts of the library. Readers can secure the use of such books late in the afternoon by giving notice earlier in the day; and on special emergencies such books can be, and are, supplied to readers without previous notice even though at some inconvenience to the staff. The trustees, who are responsible for the safety of the collections of the British Museum, state that they cannot consent to instal electric light throughout all the storage rooms and galleries of the library.

Court of Criminal Appeal.

MR. STANGER (Kensington, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he can now say when he intends to proceed with the Court of Criminal Appeal Bill.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): I hope next Wednesday under the Ten Minutes Rule.

House of Commons Dinners—Vaccinated Veal.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the hon. Member for Mid-Derbyshire, as Chairman of the Kitchen Committee, if he buys vaccinated veal for the House of Commons; and, if not, will he endeavour to purchase some if the price is moderate.

SIR J. A. JACOBY (Derbyshire, Mid.): No vaccinated veal is supplied to the House of Commons. I am informed that the veal that has the lymph taken from it is very dark in colour and on being cooked becomes quite black. I must decline to comply with the hon. Member's request.

Meat Inspection in Scotland.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will exercise the power contained in Section 8 of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, by appointing a commissioner with practical experience in meat inspection, preferably a veterinary surgeon, in connection with the inquiry at present being conducted by Dr. Dittmar into the methods of meat inspection practised by the officers of the different local authorities.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Board do not consider it necessary to associate another commissioner with Dr. Dittmar, whose inquiry will shortly be completed.

Paisley Licensing Authority.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to the remarks made by Sheriff Darling Lyell in regard to the case at Paisley, where two of the local magistrates, one a joiner named M'Naughton and the other a plumber named Kilpatrick, reported on structural alterations necessary at a licensed house, and where the joiner who undertook the reconstruction of the premises was the very Mr. M'Naughton who, in his capacity as magistrate, had ordered the work to be done to his own satisfaction and that of his brother magistrates; and where not only was this so, but the plumber who contracted to do the plumbing work to the orders of Mr. M'Naughton was the brother magistrate who also inspected, reported, and concurred in requiring this work to be done; and, having in view the foregoing facts, will he indicate what action he proposes to take in order to prevent the recurrence of such an incident.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am causing inquiries to be made on the matter referred to by the hon. Member, but they are not yet complete.

Mr. LEA: Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate to the House the result of his inquiries?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will repeat his Question a week hence.

Elgin Illegal Trawling Trial.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. M'Ewan, the marine superintendent of the Scottish Fishery Board, on the 20th of March, at the trial of Appleyard, at Elgin, that he had reported trawlers in the Moray Firth of the following nationalities, German, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, in addition to Norwegians; and whether the master or any member of the crew of these vessels has been prosecuted.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am aware of the facts referred to by the hon. Member. Trawlers of foreign nationalities in addition to Norwegian have been reported for illegal trawling in the Moray Firth. In all cases when British subjects have been so engaged prosecutions will follow.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: May I ask whether any but Norwegian trawlers have been examined at all?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, Sir, the authorities have satisfied themselves of the character of the foreign trawlers.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): How is it possible in the case of German, Swedish or Danish trawlers for the authorities to make sure there are no British subjects aboard?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The authorities have sufficient means for the purpose.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: Is it not the fact that on board these foreign trawlers the first fisherman is always a British subject?

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is not within my knowledge except in the case of Norwegian boats.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: Have there been any prosecutions except against Norwegian trawlers? Is it not the fact there have been none?

Mr. SINCLAIR: That may be so.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in view of the fact that on 20th March, at Elgin, Mr. M'Ewan, the marine superintendent of the Scottish Fishery Board, at the trial of Appleyard, first fisherman of the Norwegian trawler "Lucania," gave evidence that the vessel was British-owned, and that Appleyard was the responsible master, and that on this and other evidence he was convicted and sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment, he will make inquiries as to whether the "Lucania" is a properly registered Norwegian vessel and amenable to Norwegian law; and whether, at the time of the alleged offence against the Moray Firth by-laws, Appleyard was only temporarily in command, by permission of the Norwegian Consul, in consequence of the illness of the Norwegian master; and, if so, whether he will recommend that some change be made in the Moray Firth by-laws.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not deem it necessary to make inquiry as suggested by the hon. Member. If the facts regarding Appleyard be as stated no point of doubt will arise. As a British subject engaged in illegal trawling he is liable to prosecution. I do not propose to make any change in the by-laws.

Irish Land Purchase Repayments.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any, and, if so, how many, of the purchasers of land, under the Purchase Acts of 1891 and 1896, have availed themselves of the power given by Section 2 of the Act of 1891 of paying their instalments and redeeming in whole or in part their annuities by transferring to the National Debt Commissioners, through the post office, guaranteed land stock instead of paying cash; and will he consider the advisability of calling the attention of purchasers to the fact that, at the present price of Guaranteed Land Stock (£85 to £86), they could obtain a reduction of almost 3s. in the pound on their instalments, or in redemption in whole or in part of their annuities.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): The Land Commission inform me that there has been no transaction of the nature referred to under Section 2 of the Act of 1891. The publicity given to the hon. and learned Member's Question will doubtless have the effect of calling the attention of tenant purchasers to the fact that, having regard to the present low price of Guaranteed Land Stock, a considerable advantage may be derived from the redemption of their annuities or the payment of their instalments in the manner provided by the section quoted.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a purchaser of land, under the Purchase Acts of 1885 and 1887, who has obtained an advance of (say) £750 for the purchase of his holding, has to pay £30 a year for the first ten years, £27 a year for the second ten years, and £24 7s. 6d. for the last forty-nine years, while a purchaser under the Wyndham Act, obtaining the same advance, only pays £24 7s. 6d. for sixty-eight and a half years; that the difference, with interest at 2¾ per cent., amounts to £93 10s. 0d. to the disadvantage of the first purchaser; and will the Government consider the justice of assimilating the rates of repayment of the purchasers under the different Purchase Acts.

Mr. BIRRELL: The figures quoted in the Question are only approximately accurate. There is admittedly a difference in favour of a purchaser under the Act of 1903, in the total repayments made in respect of any given advance. This difference is due to the fact that under the Act of 1903 the rate of interest is 2¾ per cent., while under the former Acts it is 3½ per cent. I cannot hold out any hope of legislation for reducing the rate of interest payable under the former Acts.

Irish Government Return.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Return, Government Departments (Ireland), No. 8, House of Commons Papers, 1907, which was ordered by the House of Commons to be prepared on the 12th July, 1906, and which was presented on the 10th December, 1906, and ordered to be printed on 14th February, 1907, has not yet been issued; can he state the cause of this delay; and when the Return will be in the hands of Members.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not responsible for the printing and circulation of Returns to Orders of this House. I have, however, ascertained that the Report to which the hon. Member refers has now been printed, and will be issued in the course of a day or two. The Return is a very voluminous one, and the printing and revision of proofs has of necessity occupied a considerable time.

Mr. MOONEY: Seeing that this Return was ordered nearly a year ago, and we were informed only a fortnight since that it was nearly ready, will the right hon. Gentleman see that we have it in a few days?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not responsible for the printing of Returns, but I am told this will really be out in a day or two.

Irish Board of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the Report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the the working of the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) will be presented.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Chairman informs me that a meeting of the Committee is to be held on this day week for the purpose of considering the draft report. The Chairman is unable to name a precise date for the submission of the Report, but he assures me that it will be presented at the earliest possible date.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will the Report be ready for the discussion which is to take place on the 24th of this month?

MR. BIRRELL: I doubt very much that it will, but I am doing my best to expedite it. I do not much expect it before the end of the month.

Irish County Council Land Purchase Grants.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the fact that a letter has been received by the secretary of the Kildare County Council informing him that, owing to the loss on the land stock for the purchase of farms in the county of Kildare, the whole of the Probate Duty Grant, and a sum of £5,507 4s. 6d. from the Agricultural Grant, making a total of £8,464 12s. 9d., has been withheld from the county; whether he is aware that the rate for the current year, for county council purposes, was struck before this intimation was received; whether he is aware that this stoppage of £8,464 12s. 9d. means an increase of 1s. 6d. in the pound upon the rates of the county; why it was that two years' loss was allowed to accrue before any intimation was made to the council; will the council now be compelled to go to the labour and expense of striking a new rate and preparing fresh rate books and demand notes because of this delay on the part of the Treasury; and will he explain how these arrears have arisen, in view of the repeated assurances given to this House that there were little or no arrears as to the payment of purchase annuities, or are the Treasury charging to county finances in Ireland liabilities arising out of discount of Irish land stock, which discount was specifically intended and declared to be provided for from other sources.

MR. M'HUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state, for the year ended 31st March 1907, the total amount of deductions made from grants to county councils in Ireland in recoupment of losses incurred by the Irish Land Commission under the Irish Land Acts of 1891 and 1903; is he aware that inconvenience is likely to result from the failure of the Local Government Board to furnish particulars of proposed stoppages before the preparation of rate estimates for the ensuing year; and will he direct the Local Government Board for Ireland to furnish county councils with such information as will enable them to check their accounts, and make provision for possible stoppages in future.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a letter has been received by the secretary of the County Council of Longford, informing him that, owing to the loss on land stock for the purchase of farms in county Longford, a sum of £1,200 was stopped out of the half-yearly Estate Duty and agricultural grants to the county; whether he is aware that the rate for the current year for county council purposes in county Longford was struck before this intimation was made, and the applotment of the rate, including the writing up of the rate books and filling of demand notes, is now practically done; whether he is aware that the stoppage of this £1,200 means an increase of 4d. in the pound upon the rates of the county; why it was that two years' loss was allowed to accrue before any intimation was made to the council; and will the council now be compelled to go to the labour and expense of striking a new rate and preparing fresh rate books and demand notes because of this delay on the part of the Treasury.

MR. BIRRELL: The deductions in respect of land purchase which were made from the grants paid last month to county councils in Ireland amounted to £73,218. These deductions were made by the Local Government Board in pursuance of certificates, under Treasury regulations, from the National Debt Commissioners and the Irish Land Commission. The total of £73,218 comprises £60,144 in respect of the present year, and £13,074 in respect of last year. By a clerical oversight in the Chief Secretary's Office, which is regretted, the certificates for last year were not forwarded to the Local Government Board in time for the deductions to be made from last year's payments, and hence have had to be included this year. It will be seen however, that the amount for last year is little more than one-sixth of the total, and the situation, therefore, is not seriously affected by the omission. The amounts deducted in the case of Kildare and Longford were £8,464 and £1,465 respectively, and these are equivalent to rates of about 6d. and 2¼d in the pound respectively. As to how the deficiencies certified by the National Debt Commissioners arose, I must refer hon. Members to the Secretary to the Treasury. I understand that only a comparatively small portion of the deficiency arises from arrears in the payment of tenant-purchasers' annuities, and that no permanent loss on this head need be anticipated, seeing that the counties are credited with the amounts deducted when the arrears have been paid. Such arrears, I understand, are invariably paid. For instance, more than one-half of the arrears which existed on 1st February in respect of annuities due on 1st December last have already been received and paid over to the National Debt Commissioners. It is a matter for regret that inconvenience should be caused to county councils which had already struck their rates in the expectation that grants of the usual amount would be received. The question whether it may be necessary to strike a fresh rate in any given county is one for the council to determine. In deciding that question it is desirable that the council should bear in mind the possibility of a further deduction to be made next year, in which case a very heavy rate might be necessary, if the present year's burden is not borne at once. I have represented to the Treasury the desirability of considering whether some amendment of the regulations or other change may not be devised so as to make it possible to give notice to the county councils of the deductions before the time for striking their rate arrives.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what proportion of the £73,000 is for arrears on the payment of the annuities?

MR. BIRRELL: Well, I cannot say, but it is a very small portion indeed.

MR. JOHN REDMOND; I would like Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can give the Answer which the right hon. Gentleman says he is not in a position to give, as to how this enormous deduction from the grants to local authorities has arisen in connection with the Act of 1903.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am afraid I cannot on the spur of the moment. If the hon. Gentleman will put down a Question I will see.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: I desire to know whether the Chief Secretary is aware that the instalment due by county Kildare in respect of land purchase amounts to only a few hundred pounds; and how, therefore, does it come to pass that there are deductions from the allowance due to the county of £8,000. I should also like to know whether the Irish Development Grant, which is ear-marked in the first instance, is still in existence or is it entirely exhausted?

MR. BIRRELL: The reason why Kildare has to bear this large sum is that under the Act the counties have to bear in proportion to the amount of land purchased and transferred, and the Duke of Leinster's property being in that county is the reason why it has to bear so much. It is done in proportion to the amount of transactions in the respective counties. If a county had no land purchase it would not be called upon in this way. As to the amount of the Development Grant, it is not yet completely exhausted, but I think you will find that under the provision of the Statute the obligation is placed upon the counties in the manner complained of. But when the Treasury comes to look into it you will find fresh regulations will be made to obviate anything of the kind.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I wish just to add one more sentence, for the matter is one of enormous importance—the deduction of £73,000 from this grant. I wish to ask the Treasury whether—inasmuch as we are told that this does not arise from non-payment by the tenants—it is not the flotation of stock, and is it not provided by the Act of Parliament that that loss is to be met by the Development Grant and otherwise, and whether those provisions of the Statute have been, as a matter of fact, over-ridden by some regulation of the Treasury of which we hear to-day for the first time?

MR. BIRRELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Runciman) knows that the loss did not arise from the flotation of stock.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No; but the right hon. Gentleman knows what the cause is, and he is such a frank man that I am sure he will tell me.

MR. BIRRELL: I only know in part, and I certainly will not take the responsibility of appearing for the Treasury in this matter.

MR. LONSDALE asked how much of the Development Grant had been utilised in connection with the working of the Act.

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: Is it possible to put a stay upon the present quarter until the arrangements have been altered, and can the hon. Gentleman say, when these have been made, will they have a retrospective effect?

* MR. RUNCIMAN: It is quite impossible without notice to give an Answer to a highly technical Question. I can assure the hon. Member that the matter will have the fullest consideration, and that there will be no intention to withhold any part of the information.

Catholics and Irish Public Appointments.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that the bulk of salaries paid under the Board of Works in Ireland goes to the adherents of Episcopalianism; whether he is aware that of £36,493 so paid in a Catholic country only £9,793 goes to Catholics; whether he can explain how it is that, in appointments by competitive examination, Catholic candidates obtained more than half, and in appointments by nomination less than one-fifth; and whether he will investigate the matter with a view to preventing appointments by nomination from becoming a monopoly of a denomination forming barely a tenth of the population.

MR. RUNCIMAN: As I have already stated on more than one occasion, the Board of Works inform me that they have no information as to the religious beliefs of their employees. Appointments by nomination are made solely on the merits of the candidates, and no inquiry is made into their religion.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: If the appointments are made solely on merit can the hon. Gentleman explain how it is that while in competitive examinations the Catholic candidates obtain one half of the posts, in appointment by nomination they get less than one-fifth?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I can offer no explanation unless it is that more Catholics compete.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether a letter addressed by the Secretary of the Board of Works to the Civil Service Commissioners asking for an increase in the number of nominated appointments has been answered, and, if so, what was the reply?

MR. RUNCIMAN asked for notice of that Question.

Cost of Irish Postal Services.

MR. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what was the cost of the Post Office services in Ireland for 1895, 1900, and 1905; and what was the revenue from those services during the same years.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The information cannot be given for the Calendar years, but for the financial years ending on the 31st March, it is as follows:—

Year.	Expenditure.	Revenue.
	£	£
1894–5	800,980	763,647
1899–1900	1,029,120	877,971
1904–5	1,172,264	1,000,971

Agricultural Holdings Act.

MR. W. HOPE (Somersetshire, N): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that a landowner in Somerset has sent to his tenants a new clause to be added to their agreements, the practical effect of which will be to cause them to contract themselves out of The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, and in the case of any tenant declining to sign the clause has given him notice to quit his holding; and whether the Government will take action to prevent the intention of Parliament being so evaded.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The attention of my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture has been directed to this matter. In his opinion the clause to which my hon. friend refers is open to considerable objection and is likely, if pressed, to give rise to litigation. As I have already indicated, the working of the Act of last session will be carefully watched, and we shall be quite ready to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent its intention from being defeated.

London Chamber of Commerce and Tariff Reform.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that in a recent ballot in the London Chamber of Commerce, in which a majority of the members voting supported a resolution favouring Colonial Preference and Production, the majority of the Chamber declined to express any opinion whatever; whether the number of those supporting the resolution was one-third only of the total membership; and whether, in these circumstances, he will attach such importance to the resolution as it deserves.

* MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the decision was arrived at after a poll in which members could vote by proxy?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware. I have no doubt that my hon. friend's statement is in accordance with the facts, though I cannot say that I have verified it myself. I am quite prepared to attach to the resolution only such importance as it deserves.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman knew if an equal number of members of the Chamber had voted on any previous occasion.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware.

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the distress caused by the dismissal of employees, most of whom have been employed for many years in Government departments at Woolwich; if he is aware that the Colonial Office is recommending these artisans to emigrate; and if he will take steps to suspend the pending notices of discharge until some opportunity has been afforded Parliament for discussing this urgent matter.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am aware of the discharges to which the hon. Member refers, and I am afraid that further discharges are, as my right hon. friend the Secretary for War has stated to the House, inevitable, as there is not sufficient work to keep the present Arsenal staff in employment. I know nothing of the report as to the Colonial Office and emigration. Every step is being taken to supply the Arsenal with work from the Public Departments, and I can only express a hope that as the discharges are being effected at a time when there is an abundant demand for labour in the trades concerned, the workmen will speedily obtain employment elsewhere.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is it a fact that a large number of skilled workmen are going to foreign countries to use their skill in the same trades as those in which they are at present employed?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think that arises out of the Question.

* MR. J. MACVEAGH: Wait till the bloody war comes that Craig has promised, and there will be lots of work in Woolwich.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 110.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 110.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Wednesday, 1st May, and to be printed. [Bill 155].

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Daniel Daniel Sheehan, esquire, for the Mid Cork Division of the County of Cork.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they communicate Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings taken upon the Second Reading of Fitz Gerald's Divorce Bill [Lords] and Byrne's Divorce Bill [Lords], together with the documents deposited in each case as desired by this House, with a request that the same may be returned.

NEW BILL.

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Public Rights of Way," presented by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald; supported by Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Eugene Wason, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Rawlinson, Mr. Hills, Mr. Abel Thomas, Mr. William Redmond, and Mr. Arthur Henderson; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 156.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE) (TERMINATION OF BUSINESS THEREON).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Consideration of the Motion for the termination of the Proceedings upon the Business of the House (Procedure), if under discussion when the Business is postponed, be resumed and proceeded with, though opposed, after the interruption of Business."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 300; Noes, 96. (Division List No. 113.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas

Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHnRichard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M.Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)

Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth,Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh'
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp

Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominst'r
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter

Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hon. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.

Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r

Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. E'm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE) (TERMINATION OF BUSINESS THEREON).

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs), in moving a Motion for the termination of the proceedings upon the Business of the House (Procedure), said he did not imagine that in any part of the House his action in putting down this Motion could have created surprise. One or two alterations in the Rules of Procedure had been introduced to expedite business, to facilitate legislation, to secure the better consideration of measures submitted to the House, and altogether to give better facilities and a better chance for the reforms which hon. Members desired. Everyone knew that the elements and possibilities which tended to hinder legislation were very great in that House, and perhaps a great many of those elements were not without their uses. The Government, however, were strongly of opinion that they were tremendous, and Members desired to have some change in the Rules in order to improve the character of the House as a legislative assembly. The Government proposed its first Rule. During the first three days of the consideration of the new Standing Order sixteen hours were spent upon it, and the progress made amounted to eight lines; and on Thursday last the whole day of seven hours was occupied and not one line or word was passed. The particular part of the Rule now under consideration was that which laid down certain exceptions to the Bills which were to go automatically to a Standing Committee. Hon. Members had put down a series of almost indiscriminate exceptions which really destroyed the main principle and intention of the clause. He had stated quite plainly that the idea of the Government was that, with the single exception of Money Bills, no measure should be excluded from the operation of the Order, but that it was not their intention to send out of the House Bills of a high Party character—great controversial measures. They did not see any advantage in attempting a definition, and, if the House were to go over all the subjects which individual Members might desire to see excluded from the Order, they might sit there almost indefinitely and never come to an end of the matter. In these circumstances, he had expected that hon. Members would not proceed with the Amendments of which they had given notice for adding to the number of excepted Bills, but they had done so, the Amendments being rejected by huge majorities. It became almost farcical to proceed with the Rule under this fire of Amendments—Amendments which, if carried, would have the effect of destroying the Rule. The Government offered an additional day for the consideration of the Rules, and he expected an arrangement would have been come to for the convenience of Members, the fact being recognised that a Rule supported as this Rule had been ought to pass. But that was refused. The Government thought the time had now come when they might have recourse to such a Motion as he had placed on the Paper. In moving a guillotine Resolution he could not do otherwise in a certain sense than apologise for it. He recognised that it was a rough, uncouth, and, in many respects, unfair way of forcing business forward. But there was no better instrument available. He hoped there would be a general agreement in favour of some day setting up a Committee of Business to which such a matter as this could be referred. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the proceedings on the Motions with respect to Business of the House (Procedure) shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion on Tuesday, the 16th day of April, in the following manner, and subject to the following provisions:—1. At 10 p.m. on that day, Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith the Question on any Amendment or other Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments or other Motions moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but on no other Amendment or Motion), and on any other Question necessary to dispose of the proceedings to be concluded; 2. On that day the proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House; 3. On that day no dilatory Motion, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate; 4. Any opposed Private Business which has been set down for consideration on that day shall stand adjourned without Question put until such other day as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the right hon. Gentleman, in the very brief explanation he had given of his policy, on this occasion had stated, and with perfect truth, that he made the Motion with reluctance. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman was sincere in expressing reluctance to make the Motion before the House, but he considered the justification which the right hon. Gentleman had offered to be of the most meagre and jejune description. Never before had it been suggested that Rules modifying the traditional methods of procedure should be forced through the House by means of closure by compartment. When the modification of the Rules was under consideration in 1902 no less than 17 days were occupied in discussing them——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: How many Rules?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would come to that in a moment. The debate on the Rules in 1902 lasted seventeen days. But inconvenient as that expenditure of time necessarily was to the Government of the day, it never occurred to them that they could possibly bring the discussion to an end by the forcible means of closure by compartments. The right hon. Gentleman interjected across the floor of the House, "How many Rules?" It was perfectly true, as he implied, that the number of Rules discussed in 1902 was larger than the number proposed to be discussed now But the right hon. Gentleman was only going to give them five days for their discussion. He noticed with surprise that the right hon. Gentleman himself appeared greatly to underestimate the complexity as well as the importance of the proposals which he had made to the House. It might be true, and he was bound to admit that it was true, that the proposals of 1902 were somewhat more complex than those which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to carry through by ten o'clock on Tuesday. But these proposals were not, as anyone who listened to the Prime Minister's speech would suppose, confined to the question of the Committee stage upstairs. They included some other propositions of most far-reaching importance, on which the right hon. Gentleman had not so far said a word. What was his alleged justification for the absolutely unprecedented course which he was asking the House to pursue? It was that they had reached a stage of the discussion when hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House had the audacity to propose additions to the regulations which the right hon. Gentleman himself had made with regard to the Bills it was proposed to send upstairs. It might be that he thought some of their Amendments would destroy the efficacy of his Rule, and the right hon. Gentleman might perhaps make out a good case for that. But could any human being make out a case that to exclude from the provisions of this Rule Bills which effected great changes in the Constitution of the country would be to make exceptions of a kind which would destroy the efficacy of the Rule? It was preposterous to say so. The truth was that the right hon. Gentleman had greatly added to the difficulty of his task by using very ambiguous and obscure language with regard to these exceptions. He had told them that afternoon, and on previous occasions, that the procedure which he intended to substitute for the traditional procedure of the House would give a better chance of discussing all Bills, and improve the legislative machinery of the House. If that was really true, why was he going to except all Money Bills, Budget Bills and substantially all first-class Government measures from the purview of the Rule? Were they measures which ought to be imperfectly discussed? Were they measures to which it was improper to apply this improved machinery? No; everybody knew that the machinery was not an improvement. The whole action and policy of the Government showed that they did not think it even an improvement, but that it was absolutely necessary, or at any rate highly desirable, to enable the House to get through more work in the course of the session. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] Yes; but they could not have it both ways. Let the right hon. Gentleman be perfectly frank with the House and consistent with his own policy; let him admit that it was a misfortune to have to send Bills upstairs, but that it was a misfortune which they had to submit to if they were to do the whole of the legislative work he desired to see accomplished. The right hon. Gentleman was so fond of his Rule that he advanced in favour of it an argument which his own policy showed to be impossible and inconsistent with his scheme. It was because the right hon. Gentleman had held ambiguous and inconsistent language on this point that he had encouraged the Opposition to endeavour to increase the list of exceptions which he himself admitted ought to exist with regard to the general scope of his proposals. He said, then, that the Government had made their position with regard to this Rule more difficult by the fact that they had not held consistent language or unambiguous language in regard to the measures which were to be excepted. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, both in Committee upstairs and in his place in the House, had indicated his view very clearly; he did not believe that measures ought to be sent upstairs in the wholesale manner proposed by the Prime Minister. They did not know in the least what the Prime Minister meant to do with regard to the only Government measure which was at present in process of being discussed on Second Reading. They did not know what he meant to do about the Army Bill, and about other Bills promised, but which so far had not yet been read even a first time, or, as far as they had any reason to believe, got through the hands of the Government draftsmen. But he had a more serious complaint to make. The right hon. Gentleman, he thought, had not understood or grasped the number of important questions which must be decided by the House before these Rules were passed. The right hon. Gentleman had actually, as he understood him, laid down the policy that as soon as the Government had declared that they intended to adhere to a particular line, as soon as they had laid down the scope of their own policy, then it became an impertinent waste of time for any Member of the Opposition to be sufficiently audacious to suggest the smallest change in the proposals laid down by the fiat of an omnipotent Government. It was perfectly true that the Government were omnipotent; it was perfectly true that they could force through these proposals in any shape they chose, however absurd or unworkable; but he had yet to learn that it was part of their duty to bow in humble submission to these exhibitions of arbitrary temper, or to withdraw their Amendments once the Government had announced officially that they did not mean

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

to accept either those Amendments or any others of similar importance. No Opposition had ever accepted that rôle. The Opposition which the right hon. Gentleman led for many years with so much courage had never accepted it; he would be the last person to accept it, and the first to regard them as utterly unworthy of the functions thrown upon them if they obeyed the principle which he had laid down. Let him ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he had clearly grasped the magnitude of the proposals which were still to be discussed before ten o'clock the following night—if this Rule was to be passed by ten o'clock the following night, he would not say discussed. In the first place, there was a question to which the Government ought to give more thought than they had done up to the present, and that was the publicity to be given to these Grand Committees. They had to consider whether eighty or ninety gentlemen were to exercise their immense powers and privileges in private, unknown to the public, and under the conditions which used to prevail in the bad old times before Parliamentary proceedings were reported. Another question of importance was whether these Grand Committees were to sit when the Whole House was sitting, and whether that would not throw an impossible burden upon the House as well as upon members of the Government. And then there was the important question of separatist and particularist Grand Committees for Wales and Scotland. It would be quite out of order if he were to discuss that proposal, the magnitude of which surely could not escape the attention of any Member of the House. They touched very nearly upon questions to which he would not now more closely refer; but one aspect of the matter he must deal with. What machinery were the Government proposing for deciding whether a Bill was Scottish or Welsh? Was it a small matter to ask Mr. Speaker to decide whether a Bill for the disestablishment of the Church in Wales was purely a Welsh Bill or not? It would be disastrous to hurry through before 10 o'clock the following day a discussion involving matters of this kind without hearing a word from the Government as to their policy. Was it a small matter that they were relieving the Chairman of Committees of his work in connection with the Committee stage of Bills in that House, and throwing that onerous duty on Mr. Speaker? That was a most serious proposal, and it required full discussion. He did not think that closure by compartments had ever before been suggested by any Minister on any subject where the House ought to have had a freer and a fuller opportunity for debate, and where less justification for the course being taken had been given. He thought the Prime Minister's method of dealing with the matter had been unfortunate. He had told the House he was going to make one concession to the Opposition by conceding the same freedom of discussion on the Report stage as they now possessed on the Committee stage of a Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had not kept his promise in that matter. His statement was clear and explicit, and it was understood in the same sense on both sides of the House. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy understood it exactly as they understood it, and he got up and protested against it; in fact, he took occasion to strain the rules of order in order to make a protest against what he understood was the Prime Minister's promise. The Prime Minister sat and listened to the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy without suggesting that he had made a mistake, and it never occurred to anybody that the hon. Member had made a mistake. But upon looking at the Paper they found that the Prime Minister had translated that undertaking into language which broke the promise in every particular. If the Minister in charge of a Bill made a promise on one night and broke it on the next, the progress of public business was not likely to be facilitated; and, therefore, in one sense it might be fortunate for the Prime Minister that he had asked the House to continue this discussion under the fetters of a gag Resolution. They were, for the first time, asked to discuss, under guillotine proposals, revolutionary, and possibly beneficial, changes in the principles underlying the management of their business, although there had been no abuse of the Rules, and although the Opposition in opposing those changes had not exceeded what a minority ought to do, or what every minority, including that led by the Prime Minister, had in Parliamentary history invariably done.

*MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said he rose not to follow the right hon. Gentleman over the whole ground which he had covered, but to deal with his allusion to 1902, and to mention a few facts connected with what happened in 1902, when certain alterations were made in the Rules of Procedure by the then Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, speaking in the debate the other evening, said that in 1902 the present Leader of the Opposition gave seventeen days, and it was now proposed to give only five days, and he exclaimed: "What an enormous disparity!" What were the proposals of 1902? Evidently the Leader of the Opposition felt that he was on rather tender ground, because he admitted that the proposals of 1902 were different from those now under consideration. It was quite obvious that in this matter there was between the two sides of the House a great gulf fixed. In 1904 the Leader of the Opposition told his followers that he did not mean to trouble them with much legislation, but the present Government meant to legislate, and that was the difference between them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said anything of the kind.

*MR. ELLIS said that if the right hon. Gentleman doubted his assertion he could give the words and when they were spoken. The proposals which the right hon. Gentleman in 1902 placed before the House occupied a good many pages of foolscap and dealt with twenty-four Rules of Procedure. It was quite true that they had seventeen days to discuss them, but there would have been no need to occupy that period if the debates had been conducted in a Parliamentary manner. Those rules were brought forward, then postponed, and afterwards brought up again, and they never knew where they were from one night to another. The present Standing Order Book showed that one of the orders at present stood without any ending at all; as the right hon. Gentleman once said, "It remained a torso;" and that was an illustration of the manner in which the whole thing was conducted and left. He was almost amazed at the right hon. Gentleman's effrontery. He did not use the word discourteously, but it amounted to that. The changes proposed in 1902 ranged over the Order of Debate, punitive proposals of a drastic character, the power of the Speaker to adjourn the House, sittings of the House, priority of business, private business, Standing Committees, Committee of Supply, proceedings on Report, the introduction of Bills and First Readings, the Second and Third Readings of Bills, withdrawal of clauses, money Resolutions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Surely all those matters were not discussed in the seventeen days?

MR. ELLIS said he was going to state what they did in the seventeen days. Those were the subjects dealt with by the proposals placed before the House by the late Prime Minister. The House dealt with a large number of those matters; some were agreed to, and some were adjourned, but they all involved discussion. Everyone was interlinked with the others, and they could hardly discuss propositions of that kind in the House without dovetailing one into another; that was to say, without referring to matters which were not specifically before the House at the moment. His proposition was that five days gave a superabundance of time for what the Prime Minister now proposed as compared with seventeen days for the matters he had detailed to the House. Moreover, the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman in 1902 did not come before the House after the labours of a Committee who had, as in this case, carried the proposals by considerable majorities. The right hon. Gentleman's proposals came of his own will, out of his own head. The argument of the right hon. Gentleman, therefore, in regard to the time allowed for the discussion of the proposals now before the House would not hold water. There was no more Conservative Member of the House than himself in regard to Parliamentary procedure. He had been reluctantly driven to the conclusion that if the House was going to transact its business they must put in force the principle of the Committee of 1886—devolution. Hon. Members would find that there was much more reason for some of the Standing Orders now proposed than they might be inclined to think at first glance. However that might be, he was perfectly satisfied that, if Liberals meant to legislate and to do the reasonable work of the nation — he was not referring to the promises some people had made—they must delegate to and devolve on those Standing Committees a large number of Bills.

*Mr. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford) said that if the proposals brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition in 1902 were discussed for seventeen days, surely the proposals made by the Prime Minister should have more than two or three days discussion. He thought the Motion now before the House was calculated to cause surprise. On Thursday last the Prime Minister made the extraordinary statement that the Government had made up their minds that the Amendments of which notice had been given were not to be accepted, and that it was a misuse of Parliamentary time to move or to discuss any further Amendments. That was a delightful theory. Was that to be the system which was to prevail in the House in future? It seemed to him that it would make all discussion practically a farce. It would have the effect of making it perfectly superfluous to have discussion either in Committee of the Whole House or in the Grand Committees. It would be a very simple process. The Minister responsible for a Bill, or a proposal before the House, would get up at an early stage of the proceedings and say that the Government had determined that they could not accept any Amendment whatever, and that therefore the discussion might as well come to an end at once. When the Prime Minister made the extraordinary statement to which he had referred the Amendment under discussion was that Bills relating to the Army should be discussed in Committee of the Whole House. That was a substantial Amendment and deserved a good deal of discussion. The House had important constitutional responsibilities with regard to the maintenance and discipline of the Army. The scheme of the Government was to send all Bills upstairs with certain exceptions. He maintained that the Government gave away their case by the exceptions they had already admitted. If the principle contained in the new Rules was a good one, it ought to be applied to all the business of the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not now discussing the Motion before the House. He is now discussing the procedure under the Resolution.

*Mr. ABEL SMITH said he bowed to the ruling and would reserve his remarks on the point for a future occasion. He thought that the Motion before the House, looking to the character of the Amendments which they would be prevented from discussing, was a high-handed proposal on the part of the Government. The time allowed for the discussion of the new Procedure Rules was wholly inadequate.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said it could not be denied that the Prime Minister had justified the course which he had been obliged to adopt with, he was sure, great reluctance. Every section of the House suffered very materially from what had taken place. Those who had heard the dilatory Amendments which had been moved, and the dilatory talk of those who had moved them, could only come to the conclusion that the deliberate object of hon. Members opposite was merely to waste the time of the House. The Scottish Members would suffer most from the arrangement now proposed, and he suggested that, instead of the guillotine Motion applying *in toto*, as proposed, time should be apportioned to each Standing Order, so that at least the Scottish case, which was a most important matter, would not be disposed of without being discussed. No question of such magnitude, so far as Parliamentary procedure was concerned, had been before Scotland in the present generation. Mr. Gladstone, speaking in that House in 1888 on the Rules of Procedure, said—

> "I confess I am one of those who during the eight years I have been a Scottish Member—the last capacity in which I am likely to sit in this House—I mean the latest in point of time—I admit that I have felt the greatest difficulty before my assembled constituents in excusing myself and the House of Commons with reference to the handling of Scottish Business. I do not know what the experience of the hon. Member opposite has been; but I have excercised such ingenuity as either nature or practice has given me to make a decent and presentable apology to lay before the people of Scotland for the manner in which their Business—I will not say has been transacted—but let alone."

He strongly appealed to the Government to allow the Scottish representatives time to discuss this most important subject affecting the interests of Scotland.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said there was one point on which he agreed with the hon. Member for North Aberdeen, and that was as to the extreme importance of the proposals in regard to Scotland. He thought that it was little short of a Parliamentary scandal that those proposals, on which the opinions of the people of Scotland were diametrically opposed, might be passed without discussion. Under the Motion made by the Prime Minister for a time limit for discussing the new Rules of Procedure, it might be that those which were to apply to Scotland would be entirely pushed aside and carried absolutely *sub silentio*. Was that a method which ought to be approved by Scottish Members? Was that a proof of the great importance which they considered should be attached to proposals relating to legislation for Scotland? On the Notice Paper that day, there were from sixteen to eighteen Amendments put down against the proposals by supporters of the right hon. Gentleman. The Amendments put down by Members on the Opposition side of the House required adequate discussion, but they were not so numerous and they did not raise questions so important as those suggested from the Government side. In the Parliament of 1894–5 a somewhat similar proposal was brought forward by Sir George Trevelyan, who was then Secretary for Scotland; it, however, was to be only a Sessional, not a Standing Order; but under that proposal only very exceptional Bills were to be referred to a Scottish Standing Committee, and then by express Resolution, and not automatically. In the session of 1894 the discussion on that one Resolution occupied five days, although it was not nearly so important, or drastic, or intended fundamentally to interfere with the Parliamentary rights of Scotland. That Sessional Order was dropped in 1894. It was in 1895 renewed after two days discussion, and only in regard to a single Bill—the Scottish Local Government Bill. But that Bill was framed almost exactly on the same lines as the English Bill which occupied forty-two days of the time of Parliament in discussion, and there was every reason why the Scottish Bill should be discussed with no undue prolongation of debate. He did not think that any Scottish Member would say that the time was wasted in either of those years. It was to be remembered that the Amendments to the proposed Rules were to be guillotined at ten o'clock, and therefore they might be subsequently passed *sub silentio.*

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) thought that the proposal made by the Prime Minister was generally approved by the people of Scotland. What they wanted in Scotland above all was a business way of carrying through the business of the country.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was anticipating discussion which might arise at a later stage. He must confine himself to the Motion now before the House.

SIR J. JARDINE said that all he wanted to submit was that he thought the feeling of the Scottish nation was well represented by the proposal now before the House.

MR. GEORGE FABER (York) said that this was clearly a case of chickens coming home to roost. Or, to put it in another way, the reckless I.O.U.'s which the present Government distributed during the general election were now coming in, and a demand was being made for them to be paid. He maintained that to press through these new Rules of Procedure, which were of immense moment, in the short space of time allotted was nothing short of an abuse of the Rules of the House. The comparison between the seventeen days allowed in 1902 by the late Prime Minister for discussion of the new Rules then proposed and the beggarly five days now to be given was very striking. The right hon. Member for Rushcliffe had admitted that the alterations made in 1902 were not greater or more important than those now proposed. Moreover, when, in 1902, seventeen days were given for discussion, there was no guillotine. If the present Government had pursued the same course as the Government of 1902, the matter would have come to a conclusion at a proper time. The Members on the Opposition side of the House had no desire to delay business, but they did not want to have their mouths closed by the gag and the guillotine.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said that the right hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division had advanced two reasons for adopting this Resolution: first, that although it was true that the debates in 1902 had occupied seventeen days, the number of alterations was really very much larger than that now proposed; and secondly, that, though he regretted it very much, the Government had come to the conclusion that in order to facilitate the business of the House something of the sort was necessary. The right hon. Gentleman had added that the late Prime Minister had at one time stated that he was not desirous of passing legislation, whereas the present Government were desirous of legislation. It was quite true that the number of alterations in the Rules was in 1902 greater than was now proposed; but they could not always count the importance of alterations by numbers. For instance, one was that the House should meet at two o'clock instead of at three; another, that there should be a dinner hour from half-past seven to nine; and a third, that private Members' Bills should be taken on Fridays instead of on Wednesdays. All those alterations were made for the convenience of the House; but the Prime Minister was proposing alterations which limited the immemorial practice of having free discussion on the floor of the House. He was sure that the right hon. Gentleman did not in his innermost heart believe in his own case. The next defence advanced was that in order to facilitate legislation something of this sort must be done. They had had three days and not five days as some hon. Members said, and at the end of those three days the right hon. Gentleman announced his intention of moving a guillotine Resolution. At any rate he might, like the late Government, have waited till the end of the seventeenth day before he did anything so startling. They were to be prevented from discussing Amendments, a restriction which was not necessary, as the debates up to that point had not been of a dilatory nature. After ten o'clock all Amendments were to be ruled out of order and not even put from the Chair, with the exception of Amendments proposed by the Government. That was to be done by trampling upon the rights of discussion and on the rights of the minority, on the ground that it was necessary to facilitate business. He would like with the permission of the House to read some pertinent remarks from a speech of the late Sir William Harcourt which seemed apposite to the present case. Speaking on 7th February, 1902, the right hon. Gentleman said—

"May I say one word upon a question to which I do not know that any particular rule applies, but upon which a great deal has been said, and which inspires, I think, a good deal of these changes, and that is the intolerance of debate and discussion in this House? I believe that that is founded upon a complete misconception of the function of the House of Commons. I have often heard Mr. Disraeli speak in private on this subject. He said—'I wonder whether those Gentlemen know what the etymological derivation of the word Parliament is? Parliament means a body that talks and discusses. It is not a mere voting machine.' Those who remember Mr Disraeli will recollect his attitude in this House as the most patient of listeners. He said to me—'I have never understood any subject really until I have heard it well debated in Parliament'—not by ten minutes speaking. We are asked, 'Why do not you conduct yourselves like business men? Why do not you behave as if you were a meeting of shareholders or a vestry meeting?' We do not, because we are not a meeting of shareholders, because we are not a vestry meeting, but because we are the great Parliament of England, and really these miserable conceptions of the way in which Parliament ought to conduct its business, make me almost despair of the House of Commons managing to appreciate the duties it has to perform. I remember Mr. Disraeli also saying—'I have very often learned more from a bore who understood the subject than from the most brilliant speaker in the House of Commons.'"

He (Sir F. Banbury), commended these words to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite and regretted that there was only one Cabinet Minister in his place on that the most momentous occasion that had occurred for the last fifteen years. So little did the Government regard the rights of the House in the discussion of a legitimate matter that, having brought down these guillotine Resolutions an hour ago, they had not the courtesy to stay and listen to what might be said against them. That was an insult to the House of Commons.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) wished to add his protest against these Rules which the Prime

Minister had described as being of the utmost importance, being hurried through. He could only re-echo the words of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, when he said that the condition of the Front Government Bench was an insult to the House of Commons. Up to the present time any tampering with the Rules of the House had always been looked upon as a non-Party question. The Government, however, had now made it a Party affair. The proposed alterations created a revolution in the House, and ought not to be passed without full discussion being allowed. The Prime Minister's speech gave no adequate reason for the introduction of the Resolution under discussion. The right hon. Gentleman could not even get up and say that there had been obstructive speeches from the Opposition benches. It had been pointed out that when the late Government brought in their new rules, they allowed the House to discuss them day in and day out for some seventeen days, and what happened at the finish? The right hon. Gentleman would remember what happened at the finish, because if he remembered aright the right hon. Gentleman took considerable part in those debates and some of his speeches might be considered to be of an obstructive character. But at the end of seventeen days the late Government, because they found that, owing to the obstruction of hon. Gentlemen opposite, it was impossible to carry the proposed Rules, gave up the task in despair; they left them in the middle of a sentence, and that sentence had never been completed. On Thursday last they came down to the House perfectly prepared to consider the Rules at any length at which the Prime Minister wished to consider them. They were prepared to sit up with him all night and to have a free and fair discussion. The prospect of an all-night sitting, however, rather frightened the Prime Minister, and so he sent them all off to bed and brought forward this closure Resolution. Thus at the conclusion of four days the Rules were to be forced down their throats whether they liked them or not. And that was by a Government which came into office in favour of free speech and the rights of private Members. Well might the Chief Secretary for Ireland make the famous remark that minorities must suffer. That seemed to be the policy of the Government. The Opposition might be a very small minority, but they had not the slightest intention of taking this treatment lying down. The country would see that the Government were acting in a manner which was entirely without precedent. They were acting to get an advantage for themselves—to forward their own interests and not those of the House and the country. No adequate reason had been given by the Government for the suggested change. In fact, the real reason was that they were endeavouring to do too much. They gave so many pledges at the last general election that they found it difficult to fulfil them. What happened last session? The Government endeavoured to pass a great number of measures, but many of them had to be dropped, and those which were passed involved an autumn session, and Parliament sat for nine months. As to this session they had also given innumerable pledges. They had promised an Army Bill, a Licensing Bill, a Home Rule Bill, a Roman Catholic University Bill, a Land Bill for Scotland, and a Land Bill for England. How many of them did the Government intend to pass? New Rules of procedure were extremely difficult things to frame. The Opposition had been able to show that there were a great number of flaws in the proposed Rule, and it was only by ample discussion that flaws could be properly dealt with. He wished to add his protest to that of the Leader of the Opposition against the breach of faith of which the Government had been guilty in respect to the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Dublin University. The Government had promised to accept the principle of that Amendment, but when he picked up his Notice Paper, to his amazement he saw on it an Amendment entirely different from that which the Government said they intended to accept. It was not the first time the Government had committed a breach of faith with those who sat upon the Opposition Benches, and they felt that they had got to get accustomed to the practice. There were many important Amendments on the Paper, and it would be absolutely impossible to discuss them in the time allotted. He himself had an Amendment on the Paper in regard to the reporting of proceedings of the Grand Committees, but as it came last on the Paper he supposed it would be cut out by the closure. That Amendment proposed that an official report of the proceedings of, and speeches in, each Standing Committee should be taken and published in *Hansard* for the use of all Members of the House. The right hon. Gentleman promised that that matter should be thrashed out in a Committee of the House. It was an important Amendment, and he suggested that the only proper course for the Government to take up with regard to it under the present circumstances, having regard to the promise given to him by the Prime Minister, was that the Government should take that Amendment over and put it in their own name. He hoped the Government would reconsider this question, and give the House a little more time. The Government were treating the House in a very harsh manner in closing the debate at ten o'clock. Why could they not allow the House to sit up a few hours and discuss the new Rules amicably? If fair time were offered the Opposition were prepared to accept it. Nobody on the Opposition Benches had the faintest desire to obstruct the progress of the Rule. He appealed to the Government to give another day. The House would then be able to come to an amicable agreement with the Government, and they would be far more satisfied than it was possible to be under the present conditions.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) expressed astonishment that the Government had not supported by their own presence upon the Treasury Bench this remarkable Resolution. They had evidently made up their minds not to consider any extension of time which would have made their treatment of the House less oppressive. He had watched the changes of procedure of the House for many years, and he believed this was the first occasion upon which closure by compartments had been proposed by the Government of the day, merely in order to advance their own business, and not to put an end to obstruction and dilatory action on the part of the Opposition. The main grounds on which Amendments to the new Rule were moved were the summary manner in which it was proposed that Bills should go to a Grand Committee, and the unsatisfactory manner in which Motions were to be made that particular Bills should be retained in the House. He much regretted that it seemed to be becoming the practice for Members to make a speech and immediately leave the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe had made a speech in which he strongly supported the Motion made from the Treasury Bench. The right hon. Gentleman had left the House, but they might learn wisdom from his lips. In 1902 the right hon. Gentleman said he regretted that he had ever voted for the guillotine, and went on to say that so long as he remained in the House he would never vote for another such Motion. He further said he was an anti-closure man; that he believed the use of the closure marked the Parliamentary incapacity of those concerned in its use, and that users of it were not entitled to the same respect from the House as were the right hon. Gentlemen who piloted the Finance Bill and the Parish Councils Bill through the House without resort to the closure. The Government had fallen from the high ideals of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe, who had given them the most effective support he could to the Motion, but had not thought fit to listen to the comments on it. The Prime Minister said he had moved the Motion with great reluctance, but he had not, like his predecessors in office, shown that the time occupied in discussing the new Rule had been so long and the discussion so fruitless that the Government had no alternative but to resort to the closure. The right hon. Gentleman did not say there had been any dilatory action on the part of the House; he only said they must "get on." Let them get on by all means, but let the House note that for the first time in the history of Parliament a Motion of this kind had been moved by the Government for the facilitation of their own business without any argument being placed before the House in support of their contention. On the last occasion when this new Rule was debated the Government admitted they were not able to answer the questions put to them. What was to be done with the Bills already remitted to

Standing Committees? What was to be the attitude of the Government with regard to them? Had they thought of that and provided a remedy? Comparisons had been drawn between the Rules of debate introduced by the Leader of the Opposition and those now proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, and reference had been made to the fact that seventeen days were taken to discuss those of his right hon. friend before the closure was applied. But so far as he was concerned that was not the question. It was enough to say there never was a change made of so far reaching a character as that proposed by this new Standing Order. It would be impossible to resist the action of the Government, but he did not think any moderate man on the Government side of the House would adopt the cry that the Opposition had attempted to obstruct the Government proposals. The change would not advance, but retard business; there would have to be still further alterations, and he firmly believed the country would say that the Government had no right to pass a Motion of this kind without giving the House time to consider it.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he had listened with interest to his hon. friend the Member for Holderness, who had suggested that the course which ought to have been taken was that the House should have been asked to consider these proposals at a late sitting, probably an all-night sitting. In frankness and candour he wished to say that though he disapproved of the course taken by the Government, he could not himself think that an all-night sitting was a desirable alternative.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: I do not mind.

LORD R. CECIL said his hon. friend was good enough to say that he did not mind. But that was not the only question. He thought that that particular way of getting through their business, or pretending to get through it, was one that ought never, under any circumstances, to be adopted. But, none the less, he could not regard the present Resolution as a great improvement even on an all-night sitting. He was against all these "methods of barbarism" in dealing with the business of the House, methods which had one certain result—they destroyed the prestige of the House. If it was only the present House of Commons he would regard such an event with equanimity. He did not think that they were likely to do much which he would admire, and the less capable the present House was of important legislation the better he would be pleased. He had not that admiration for the principles of the present majority which would lead him to think that their legislation would be beneficial. He was sure that a Resolution of the kind now proposed materially diminished the power of the majority of the House to carry a great Resolution on such a question as the House of Lords. If they were going to attack the House of Lords, they might be perfectly certain that they would not be successful without mature and proper consideration; and if it was to be said that the House was being muzzled, and that their ancient privileges had been curtailed, the country would pay very little attention to the verdicts at which they arrived on that and other questions. There was another great objection to a Resolution of this kind. The legislative functions of the House had already been to a great extent transferred to the Government of the day. He believed that right hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House thought that it should be the Government of the day who shaped the legislative action of the House. They put it in that courteous way; but what it meant was that the Government were to decide on the legislation and the House were to sanction that decision. That, he feared, was past praying for. But there was left to them the deliberative power of the House, no less important than the legislative power. Resolutions of this kind, however, shattered and destroyed that deliberative power, and when both the deliberative and the legislative powers of the House had been destroyed, he very much feared that there would not be attracted the most desirable persons to fulfil the high and important duties attaching to Membership of the House. For his part, therefore, he very much regretted this new departure. It would be exceedingly unfortunate if, owing to the operation of this Resolution, the proposal in regard to the Scottish Committee received no discussion at all. It appeared to him that that deserved the full discussion of the House. On Resolutions affecting the procedure of the House there was only one opportunity of discussion,. It would be conceded by everyone that the proposal as to the Scottish Committee was of enormous importance. At the present moment, when a Bill affecting Scotland was sent to a Standing Committee, the Committee of Selection put upon the Committee fifteen experts, who would naturally be Scottish Members, who would know something about the subject, and, the Committee would have full advantage of their knowledge on the matter. But the purpose of this Resolution was to prevent any but Scottish Members taking part in the discussion at all. It was an exclusive and not an inclusive Resolution. That amounted to an assertion that nobody but Scottish Members were capable of discussing Scottish affairs. That was a principle of very far-reaching importance—how far, could be seen by the claims from various sections of the House to have the same principle applied to them. There was the Welsh claim, which, since it was backed by a large Liberal representation, the Prime Minister had immediately conceded. There was the London claim. Unfortunately for the hon. Member who was responsible for it, London had, in exceeding bad taste, returned a considerable number of Conservatives and Unionists, and therefore the Prime Minister promptly ignored the claim.

Sir EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.): The claim has not been ignored.

Lord R. CECIL said the claim had been absolutely ignored so far as the Prime Minister was concerned, unless the hon. Gentleman had some secret understanding with the right hon. Gentleman. Then there was the case—he must apologise for mentioning it—of England. He was quite aware that under the present administration it seemed to be regarded as axiomatic that Scotland and Wales were entitled to special treatment, but no special privilege of any kind was to be given to England. That, it appeared to him, was one of the questions which might well be a matter for discussion; it was a matter of importance, and one in which the country took some interest. He regretted very much that under this Motion such discussion would be practically precluded. There were about three pages of Amendments on the Paper and a fourth page with regard to the Scottish Committee, and as there would not be more than five or six hours for the Amendments preceding those referring to the Scottish Committee, it was incredible that they would reach discussion on the latter question at all. The question of the Scottish Committee had been presented to the House by the Prime Minister in a most perfunctory manner, and was to be voted upon absolutely *sub silentio.* Therefore, he earnestly pressed the House to support the Amendment of which he had given notice and which he now moved, to the effect that the proposal as to the Scottish Committee should be omitted from the Resolution. He appealed to hon. Members not to assent to the Resolution without some such limitation in order that this important change in their Constitution should not be made without, at any rate, fair discussion.

*Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire), in seconding the Amendment, asked the Government to give it their consideration, for the reason that in regard to the constitution of the proposed Scottish Grand Committee there was a good deal of difference of opinion among hon. Members and also in the Scottish constituencies themselves. The Government had only to look at the Amendments on the Paper by Scottish Members in order to convince themselves of this. Time should be given for full and fair discussion of the matter; but under the present Resolution there would be no discussion at all, and the whole thing would be "guillotined." Many thought, that the question of the constitution of the Scottish Committee required a good deal of sifting and it would be a pity if discussion were stifled. He thought that the Government would do well to give consideration to the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'Procedure,' to insert the words 'other than so much of such Motions as refers to the establishment of a Scottish Committee.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) regretted exceedingly that the Government had found it necessary to introduce the guillotine at all. He thought that the Prime Minister was not particularly in love with it himself, and had only introduced it with the intention of expediting business. He did not say where the blame lay, but he could not but regret that they had not more of what there used to be, namely, "deals" with regard to public business. He did not know whether any suggestion had been made on one side or the other, or whether there was a spirit on the other side not to accept any arrangement which would have made this Resolution unnecessary, but there seemed to be an absence of that disposition to come to arrangements which he had seen session after session during the fifteen years he had been in Parliament. He regretted that, in the first place, because it introduced a temper into their debates which was greatly to be deprecated, and nobody suffered from it more than the Government of the day. He was a strong disciple of the Prime Minister when he stood up for the policy of "splitting the difference." He always thought it a good policy for getting business through. He was sorry they were occupying time in discussing this Motion which might have been usefully given to the discussion of the Procedure Rule. Somebody had said the Rules were a Party matter. Certainly they ought not to be. He was afraid he was rather conservative on many matters, and this was one of them. They were setting up, for good or for evil, a form of procedure which would be permanent, unless some future Government interfered with it; and it was of vital importance, therefore, if these Committees upstairs were to have that importance which in his opinion they demanded, that the House as a whole should be parties to the arrangement. They knew what the result would be when the Bills came back from those Committees. He regretted that the Government had regarded the course they had taken as necessary. He did not blame the Government, because they were responsible for the business of the House, but he would have much preferred it if the question had been made a matter of general understanding between both sides of the House, for then the time of the House would have been much better occupied. He could not agree with what the hon. Member for Aberdeen had said in regard to what he called the undoubted obstruction which had taken place. The Prime Minister did not make that the basis of his Motion, his ground being that they must get on with public business. He did not think that, in the ordinarily accepted sense of deliberate obstruction, there had been any undue abuse of the rules of debate on this very important question. The immediate question was whether the Motion should apply to the Scottish Grand Committee, or whether that point should be left to be considered on some future day. If they accepted the noble Lord's Motion it would probably delay the consideration of the subject until the end of the session, with no guarantee that they would have an opportunity of considering it at all. He would remind the House that they had before had a Scottish Grand Committee which represented the whole House, and there was no vital difference between that Committee and the one now suggested. He regretted that it had not been found possible to settle the question without the aid of the guillotine, but as he was in favour of setting up a Scottish Grand Committee he should vote against the Amendment.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the hon. Member who had just sat down had stated that the Government had made no attempt to come to an arrangement with the Opposition in regard to bringing the debate on this Rule to a close.

Mr. DALZIEL said he had not made any such assertion. What he said was that he did not know whether any such attempt had been made.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said there was a way of saying one "wondered" whether any attempt had been made which implied that no attempt had been made. If his hon. friend had been in the House when he introduced this Motion, he would have heard him say that an attempt was made to come to an arrangement with the Opposition in regard to the new scheme of procedure; and it was because they were told that the arrangement would not be accepted, that no other arrangement would be listened to, and that the Opposition had determined to fight the thing to the bitter end, that the Government had resolved to take another course. He agreed with the noble Lord as to the importance and the expediency of having an opportunity of discussing the appointing of a Scottish Grand Committee, but why could they not discuss it? Simply because so much time had been thrown away by the Opposition moving unimportant Amendments, by unnecessary repetition, and by other means of occupying time. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."] Now they were asked to exclude the question of the Scottish Committee from this proposal, and to reserve it until a more convenient season. They wished to get that Grand Committee started because business of great importance was waiting to be referred to it. The time at the disposal of the Government was already mortgaged for other business of great importance, for the carrying through of which the setting up of this Scottish Committee was required. Therefore it was quite impossible to accept the Amendment. Without any desire to diminish the authority of the noble Lord in this matter, perhaps he might be allowed to say that he had not been very long in the House, and he had certainly not been a Member long enough to have had much experience of those questions which had been before the Scottish Committee. There was a Scottish Commiteee in 1894 which worked exceedingly well, and passed most useful legislation. It proved an immense success and passed one or two most important measures which had proved a blessing to Scotland ever since, and it was because it was not continued that there had been practically no Scottish legislation since. It would be seen that it was upon past experience they were proceeding, and that diminished the necessity that might otherwise have existed for a full and elaborate discussion of the principle of a Scottish Grand Committee. The Government could not make any exception to their Motion. Those who wished to criticise the new Procedure Rule should have confined their Amendments to points of importance; if that had been done there would have been abundance of time for the discussion of the proposal of a Scottish Grand Committee. But that course had not been taken, and the Government, therefore, were compelled to make this Motion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said the Prime Minister had suggested that, because they had a different kind of Scottish Committee established under a Sessional Order thirteen years ago, therefore it was unimportant and of no consequence that they should discuss a proposal to constitute a new form of Scottish Committee this year. That was a declaration which had aroused considerable difference of opinion not merely among the Members of the House, but among people outside. The right hon. Gentleman was so anxious for Scotland's welfare, and so tender of her interests, that he could not find even a single day to discuss an important question on which Scottish opinion was, as the hon. Member had said, so widely divided. [Cries of "No."] Of course, when doctors differed, they must settle the matter among themselves. He had correctly represented what was said by the hon. Member for Stirlingshire, and was that not enough to prove his case? It was not only the interests of Scotland that were concerned. The right hon. Gentleman was forced by the precedent which he was in the course of creating to support another sectional or Grand Committee which, by the necessity of the case, must be differently composed from that for Scotland. Was the House to have any opportunity of discussing that? The right hon. Gentleman was in favour of referring all Scottish measures to a Committee in which the Scottish Members would form a majority, and in a Committee of eighty they would form a considerable majority. But Wales, having very many fewer Members, would stand in a wholly different position in the Welsh Grand Committee from that which Scotland would occupy in the Scottish Grand Committee. These were matters which were worthy of consideration. The House ought to know how the Government justified their proposals, but they were to have no opportunity of discussing them. The Prime Minister said he was anxious that the Scottish Grand Committee should get to work at once. On what? No Scottish Bill had passed the Second Reading. There was no reason for this hurry. There had, indeed, been a Land Tenure Bill for Scotland introduced, but was not that one of the measures which by the declaration of the Prime Minister it was not the intention of the Government to refer to a Committee upstairs?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Why not?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that was a grave announcement and showed the necessity for full debate. The House had been repeatedly told that it was not intended to send the principal or highly contentious Government measures to these Committees. Was the Land Tenure Bill a principal measure, or was it merely a by-product? It was certainly supposed that such a Bill would fall within the category of those the Government would exempt by motion. If it was intended to send such a Bill upstairs, the proposal became ten times more important. It would be a monstrous infringement of the rights and privileges of Parliament that such a proposition should be put through without discussion on the fiat of the Government. The Government had had the opportunity of carrying out a reform of procedure with the hearty approval of the Opposition; but, having chosen a set of Rules which they must have known to be highly contentious, they had only themselves to thank for the discussion that had arisen. If the discussion of the new rules had taken three, four, or five days more, it would have been a very moderate allowance of time compared with the time spent on the same subject when the Conservative Government was in office At any rate, the particular point to which the present Amendment was directed, namely, the exclusion from the guillotine resolution of the proposal to set up sectional Grand Committees, taking Members from one part of the House instead of from the House as a whole, was one which should be accepted by the Government. If the proposal of the Government were passed without discussion, it would be a scandal.
he hoped even this House of Commons would not sanction.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL said the Government were perfectly justified in proposing the guillotine with respect to the Amendments dealing with the classes of Bills to be exempted from the operation of the Rule. He understood from the Prime Minister on another occasion that it was on that series of Amendments the House had taken up sufficient time. He understood the right hon. Gentleman had brought forward the guillotine Resolution to release the House from that difficulty, but the Motion had been moved in a form which would penalise not only the Members who had put down that series of Amendments, but also other Members of the House, supporters of the Government, who wished to have an opportunity of discussing what kind of Grand Committees ought to be set up. He was not speaking with the object of embarrassing the Government in any way. This was not a Party question. He was entirely opposed to hon. Gentlemen opposite taking up so much time on the question whether certain Bills should go to the Grand Committees. That part of the proposal ought to be guillotined, but a fair opportunity should be given for discussing what kind of Standing Committees should be set up. He had taken the trouble to ascertain the number of public Acts passed by this House during the last thirty years. He found that there had been 1,285 passed affecting the United Kingdom as a whole; 132 affecting England and Wales; 204 affecting Scotland; 248 affecting Ireland; seventy-four affecting London; and five affecting Wales. Did not these figures prove that the House before deciding what kind of Standing Committees were to be set up should have full opportunity of discussing the kind of business to be done, having regard to past experience? Great injustice would be done to certain sections of the House if that course was not followed. In the past when Scottish Bills were considered in Committee of the Whole House, and the Scottish Members remained in the House, it was practically a Scottish Committee. If there was a London Bill before the House they could rely that the London Members would remain in the Chamber. Private Bills would not be affected by his proposal: but if General Public Bills applying only to London were sent upstairs to a Committee of eighty Members many London Members would lose the opportunity which they had at present of making a contribution to debate. He had spoken to private Members and even to members of the Government on the matter, and they seemed to think that in making his proposal for a Special Grand Committee for London he was not fully justified, because they asked, "What about Lancashire and Yorkshire?" [Laughter.] Hon. Members laughed as if he were making a geographical comparison. His comparison was as to the amount of business which the House was called upon to do in regard to the London area. He appealed to the Prime Minister to give his support to the change which he proposed. During the last thirty years Wales had had only five Public Acts applying separately to the Principality; whereas London in the same period had had seventy-four Bills before the House. The proposal was not a fair recognition of the claims of London—more especially when the principles of the Bills applicable to London and the urgency of the problems with which they dealt were considered. He thought that the guillotine Motion should apply to the earlier part of the Government proposals, so that a discussion might be allowed with regard to setting up a Grand Committee for London. If the Bills for the different Grand Committees were not ready at the beginning of the session the arrangements could be altered so that the best use of hon. Members could be made to deal with Irish, Scottish, Welsh, and London Bills.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) understood that a few Ministers, including the Prime Minister himself, had complained that he had declined to come to any arrangement with regard to the discussion on the Rules of Procedure. What happened? On Thursday last the Prime Minister proposed to take certain Navy Votes on the following Monday, on Tuesday the Second Reading of the Army Bill was to be taken, and on Wednesday certain minor measures like the Patents Bill. When pressed on that question the right hon. Gentleman said that if the Rules of Procedure debate was not concluded on Thursday night—a proposition which never for a moment appeared to be possible to hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House—he would continue the debate on Monday. About eleven o'clock the Patronage Secretary spoke to him behind the Chair and asked him if there was any chance of coming to an arrangement, and he told the Patronage Secretary that the only arrangement he could come to was in regard to the Army Bill, and that the Opposition were ready to give the Second Reading of that Bill if a full day were given to its discussion. He could not understand what the Government wanted in regard to the Rules. At that moment the Eleven o'clock Rule was suspended, and he said to the Patronage Secretary that the debate might go on to two, three, four o'clock in the morning, or after, and under those circumstances it was impossible for him to come to an arrangement. Immediately after that, the Prime Minister, instead of taking advantage of the facilities the House had given him of continuing the debate, announced that he would move a guillotine Resolution. It was not likely he would make a bargain after that. There was another thing which the Government had overlooked. At the moment it was attempted to make a bargain on Thursday there stood on the Paper Amendments to the Rules of Procedure in the names of no less than thirty-two of the supporters of the Government, and he was acting not only as trustee for his own side of the House, but in the interests of the House generally. He might tell the right hon. Gentleman and his friends that, until he got orders to the contrary from his leader, he would not make any bargain of a kind which surrendered the liberties of the House, so long as he held the position he now occupied.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he quite agreed that the House should have an opportunity of discussing the proposals of the Government. The time taken up in discussing Scottish Bills was generally consumed by hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House. If Bills were sent to the Grand Committee, Scottish Members would have an opportunity of discussing them which they did not have in Committee of the Whole House. He understood that the Amendment now under discussion was to cut Scotland out of the Grand Committee proposal altogether. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] Well, that was how he read it. The main reason for bringing forward the proposal was that they might have an opportunity for discussing Scottish business, otherwise they could not get any Scottish business done at all. For anyone to suggest that there was much or any difference of opinion in Scotland on this matter was absurd. In fact what the Scottish people were asking for was something more than a Grand Committee; they were asking for Home Rule, but they were willing to take a Grand Committee as an instalment. There was another reason. Scotland generally was in advance of the rest of the United Kingdom; and Scotland was willing to show by passing legislation for her own people a good example to the rest of the United Kingdom, although he did not know that the rest of the United Kingdom would follow that example very rapidly They had been told by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer that England would inevitably get the reforms that Scotland got.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN was understood to say that he never said that.

MR. MORTON said he took it down at the time. If that were true, why had England not Sunday closing which was passed for Scotland sixty years ago, or a complete system of national education such as they had had in Scotland for hundreds of years? But was that any reason for Scotland not getting the reforms that were absolutely necessary for the welfare of her people and of the whole of Great Britain? He believed that even now they could discuss the question and come to as intelligent a decision as they could if they were to debate it for weeks. He did not blame the Tory Party for their action in the matter, because they were merely acting according to their nature, and did not want the House to pass legislation. England wanted a good many reforms and so did Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, but the Tory Party said they should not have them. Last year a Bill which affected not only England and Wales, but Scotland, was sent up to the Grand Committee, passed that Committee, and came down to this House and was passed into law.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Gentleman was straying from the question before the House, which was the method of dealing with the Procedure Resolutions. He must confine himself to the question before the House; what he was saying had nothing to do with the Rules.

MR. MORTON said he only wanted to point out that if what was mainly an English Land Bill could go before a Grand Committee and be dealt with, surely a Scottish Land Bill could also go there. He hoped that the Prime Minister with his immense majority would insist upon doing some business, in spite of the fact that it was the desire of the Tory Party not to do business. Ministerialists, however, wished to do business, and above all, what the Members for Scotland wanted was the establishment of this Scottish Committee. They were told last session that Scotland must wait, but he thought that they had a right to insist upon the Rules being altered, so that the House of Commons might be in a position to do business and to carry out the many important reforms which were desired by the Scottish people for the welfare of the whole of the population. He trusted, therefore, that the Amendment would not be supported by any Liberal Members on any account whatever, because the main reason they wanted this alteration of the Rules of Procedure was to obtain this Scottish Committee, so that matters affecting Scotland might be referred to Scottish Members and to Scottish Members only.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he must congratulate the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, on having exercised in favour of the facilitation of business those gifts of concise exposition of which they had had such long and pleasurable experience. He himself rose, not to continue the debate initiated by the right hon. Gentleman, but to make an appeal to the Government. Of course it would not be worth making if it absolutely traversed their policy, but he proposed to ask them to do something to remove what he thought they must feel to be the greatest blot upon their proposal. He objected to bringing any debate on the Rules of the House to a violent close, until the necessity had been more amply proved than it had been on the present occasion; but he waived that point now, and asked the Government whether they could not do something to avoid the scandal of making part of the permanent machinery of Parliament a Scottish Committee which had never been made a part of their permanent machinery, and of instituting for the first time a Welsh Committee, of which nobody had ever yet heard, and refusing, if those principles were accepted, even to discuss the possibility of an extension to other parts of the country which might have as great a right to such Committees as Wales or Scotland, or a greater right than they had. Would it be impossible for the Government, if they thought a clear and precise limit must be put to this discussion, to exclude from the Rule as printed the subject of the Scottish and Welsh Grand Committees, and the Amendments to the proposal for Grand Committees, and, having accepted that Amendment, to add a rider stating that two full Parliamentary days would be given to the discussion of the Amendments to Standing Order 47? If hon. Members would look at their Papers they would see that all these proposals and Amendments came up under Standing Order 47, and he would suggest that two days should be given to their discussion, and when those days had concluded there should be the same form of guillotine as was now proposed. The House would then be relieved of the fear of an unlimited series of Amendments postponing to an indefinite future the conclusion of the discussion on the Government's proposals. They would know exactly the amount of time which could not be exceeded in the discussion of these Rules, and they would have avoided the grave inconvenience and scandal, and the unprecedented blot on their debates, of having carried out a revolutionary change in Parliamentary procedure with such an absence of discussion and divisions as was now contemplated. He made this suggestion in a spirit of conciliation.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.), whilst appreciating the spirit which animated the right hon. Gentleman, said it was impossible for the Government to assent to the proposal that two days should be given to the discussion of these Rules. It was impossible to minimise the importance of the Scottish or Welsh Grand Committee question, but a considerable amount of time would be available that evening. [Cries of "Private Bill."] The private Bill was, he understood, unopposed. The Government would be ready to give facilities with a view to placing the time on the following day under the control of the Opposition, practically from four until ten o'clock, for bringing forward the Amendments to which they attached the greatest importance. That was, he thought, a very fair response to the right hon. Gentleman.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 108; Noes, 314. (Division List No. 114).

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Wor.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. E'm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Muntz, Sir Philip A.

Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Waring, Walter
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Smeaton.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, R'mf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur, W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacy
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L,
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas

Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkBg'hs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowland, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott. A.H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) moved an Amendment to exempt from the operation of the Rule the proposal with regard to a Welsh Committee, and also the application of Standing Orders 26 and 27 giving power of closure, to Grand Committees. So far as the first part of this Amendment was concerned it did not come under the ban of the Prime Minister, who had desired the House to concentrate their attention on and to discuss the most important of the Amendments. Had the debate on the Rule concluded on the previous Thursday they could not possibly have concentrated their attention on the Amendment just placed upon the Paper. There was a strong case for the exclusion of the Welsh Committee because there had been no opportunity of ascertaining the Government's position on the point. Wales was not in the same position as Scotland, and therefore the question that arose was entirely different. Wales was to be attached to one of the Standing Committees, and the Motion of the Prime Minister proposed to alter Standing Order 48. Hitherto it had been possible for the Committee of Selection to alter the general body of Members who sat on Grand Committees, but the Prime Minister now proposed to make the members of those bodies irremovable. To those bodies were to be added fifteen under the Standing Order to which the Welsh proposition was attached. And now having got a Standing Committee the Members of which were irremovable and to which fifteen Members were to be added, it was proposed to add thirty-two more, all of one complexion of politics, a policy which was directly opposed to all the principles of their Constitution. An entirely new principle was to be adopted. That was a condition of things that required and deserved some discussion in the House, but which under this guillotine proposal would be voted on without any debate whatever, and without a single word of explanation from the Government as to how the scheme intended to work. Another matter which ought not to be passed *sub silentio* was the proposal of the Government under which the whole of the powers of closure were to be given to the Standing Committees. Anybody who looked back to the time when the closure was introduced into that House knew what interest it excited, but it might not be within the recollection of the House that in the last Parliament the Deputy Chairman of Committees, a salaried official of the House, had not the right to accept the closure except on a declaration made to the House that the Chairman was unavoidably absent. They were now proposing to give those powers to Chairmen sitting upstairs. They were giving these Committees power to cut short debates at the very moment they were professing a desire to give greater freedom of discussion. He did not think that this was a proposal which the House should sanction. He urged that before the Standing Order was passed the House should have some opportunity of discussion. It was undesirable that the Standing Order now proposed should be adopted. They had always had Standing Orders which were applicable to the condition of things in the House whichever Party was in power. Let them take the proposal for a Welsh Committee, and suppose the Constitutional Party were returned to power. How would it be possible for the Welsh Committee any more than the Scottish Committee to exist if entirely composed of Welsh Liberal Members? The Members for Wales were generally of the opposite way of thinking to the Unionist Party, and it would be impossible for a Unionist Government to entrust legislation to Grand Committees of that nature, because no Government would consent to send legislation to Committees on which they were in a minority. Therefore, they were proposing Standing Orders which must be altered whenever there was a change in the balance of opinion in the House. If, as was suggested, these were made only Sessional Orders, of course the matter could be rectified; but as long as the Government insisted on their being Standing Orders, he earnestly urged that they should at least give an opportunity for discussion of the two very important matters dealt with in his Amendment. He begged to move.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor), in seconding the Amendment, said that in regard to the question of a Committee for Wales the attitude of the Government had indeed been remarkable. Nobody knew that this Welsh Standing Committee was going to be set up at all, but at the last moment the Prime Minister apparently had yielded to the threats of the hon. Member for Swansea and other Welsh Members, and they were now obliged to agree to an Amendment of the Standing Order which would revolutionise the system of procedure as regarded Welsh Bills, without there being the slightest opportunity of full and fair discussion. It was most essential that this Welsh proposal should be exempted from the Resolution. It was unfair to the House that they should be left in that position, and that a proposal which because it was unfair could not be permanent should be passed by means of the closure. If the Government brought in another Welsh Disestablishment Bill, would it be relegated to this small, and, without offence, he would say packed Committee upstairs, and then when it came down to the House on the Report stage be dealt with under conditions which would allow hon. Members to make only one speech? He did not know what the Prime Minister proposed to do in that respect, but they had all believed and hoped that he would assent to a provision for plurality of speeches on the Report stage. That, apparently, was not to be. It made it all the more unfair that this proposal with regard to the Welsh Committee should not be discussed. As regarded the other portion of the Amendment, there were equally strong grounds for excepting it from the guillotine Motion. Formerly, they used to be extremely chary about applying the closure at all, and if its application had been more strongly opposed by one Party than another, he would have thought it was by the Party now in office; yet that Party deliberately proposed not merely that the guillotine should be used in the House, but that it should also be used in Grand Committees upstairs. Much of the valuable work of amending Bills was done in Grand Committee, but if the proceedings were to be subject to closure the value of the work would be very much diminished. On the other hand, if the Bill was to be carefully examined and fully amended in all its details, and in all respects properly considered, they must not merely send it up to the Grand Committee, which had proved so valuable in the past, but they must not fetter the discussions in that Committee. He appealed most strongly to the Government and the House to let this matter be thrashed out thoroughly before they altered the Standing Orders, and to except from the Resolution that part which related to the closure.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'Procedure,' to insert the words 'other than so much of such Motions as refer to the establishment of a Welsh and Monmouthshire Committee and which apply the Standing Orders 26 and 27 (Closure) to the Standing Committees.'"—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said the Rules of Procedure introduced by the Leader of the Opposition in 1902 raised no such questions as were involved in the proposals of the Prime Minister. He had only to direct attention to the Amendments to be moved by his right hon. friend the Member for the Hallam division of Sheffield. For instance, Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom, Bills to ratify treaties, Conventions, or other international instruments——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not addressing himself to the Amendment which refers to a Committee for Wales and Monmouthshire.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said his object was to show that matters of great magnitude were involved, and that the question which had been raised by his hon. friend behind him was of even still greater magnitude than those subjects to which he had referred. In that House, so far as the Government were concerned, there were two Parties—one the Labour Members below the Gangway, and the other the President of the Board of Trade. They were both very powerful. The Labour Members had been able to secure certain concessions, and the President of the Board of Trade had been able to secure for Wales a special Standing Committee. If the Labour Members, or Saul, had slain his thousands, David had slain his tens of thousands. Behind the proposals of the Prime Minister was a process of devolution. He believed that the scheme for a Scottish Grand Committee and a Welsh Grand Committee was a species of devolution intended to lead up to the larger policy of which the right hon. Gentleman was the most distinguished exponent. Presently they would have from the Nationalist Benches a proposal to establish an Irish Standing Committee. [Cries of "Why not."] He had never known Irish Members in that House to miss an opportunity to secure some sort of concession, valuable or less valuable. If they once established the principle of Standing Committees for each portion of the United Kingdom they would be striking a blow at the very union of discussion which when the Union was created it was intended to have. The whole tendency was antipathetic and that was an extremely bad thing. The proposal to establish a Welsh Standing Committee, small as it might seem, taken in conjunction with the Scottish Standing Committee was a blow at general discussion in the House. The proposals put forward by the Government were such as to entitle them to a much longer time for discussion than would be given if this Motion were carried. The question fundamentally affected the rights and obligations of hon. Members. If every Welsh and Scottish question was to be sent upstairs, an evil which they had always deplored would be intensified. Upon one occasion, when he ventured to discuss the principle of local option, he was looked upon with perfect astonishment because Scotland only was concerned. The principle involved, however, was one which affected the whole country. If it was considered indiscreet for an hon. Member representing an English constituency to intervene in a Scottish debate, how much worse would it be when these particular questions were sent to Scottish, Welsh or Irish Committees for discussion. By opposing these proposals the Opposition were performing a duty which he was sure would be recognised some day by hon. Members opposite.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said the hon. Member who moved the Amendment argued that the Welsh proposal was of such first-rate importance that the House should have the fullest opportunity of discussing it. What was the proposal? It was to include the thirty-four Welsh Members in one of the Committees which had to deal with a Bill which was exclusively Welsh. The Committee of Selection now added fifteen Members to an ordinary Committee. These fifteen Members in the case of a Welsh Bill would form part of the thirty-four Welsh Members. In ordinary circumstances there were five or six Welsh Members on one of the Standing Committees. There remained, therefore, thirteen or fourteen more Welsh Members who would be put on the Committee, possibly in exchange for others. The result was that out of a Committee of eighty Members there would be thirty-four Welsh Members to deal with a Bill which was exclusively Welsh. That matter was considered by hon. Gentlemen opposite of such importance that it should be excluded from the operation of this Resolution. The second point raised was that the proposal to give the Chairmen of these Committees power to grant the closure was so important that it ought to have a special opportunity for full discussion. It was obvious that the powers of the Chairmen at present were inadequate and unsatisfactory, and he would have thought it was the general desire of the House that such a power should be granted. He did not think the proposal of the Government was of such a novel and revolutionary kind as to justify these Amendments.

MR. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman had not realised the real strength of the opposition to his proposals. It was not a mere matter of adding so many members to the Committee. The real question was whether the new Grand Committee was to reflect the opinion and composition of the existing House of Commons, or whether it was to be composed of the Members for that particular part of the country with merely those added to bring it up to the necessary number. The representation of Wales was for the most part in the hands of one Party. Did the Government seriously propose that, in order that the Grand Committee should represent the House, they should add to it a sufficient number of English and Scottish Members to flood the Welshmen and prevent their representing the Principality and giving to the Committee the political complexion that their representation justified? The Government were proposing to overshadow them by the representatives of other parts of the country. The right hon. Gentleman said it was a small proposal, but the Member for Gravesend had shown beyond answer that it was unquestionably the beginning of a very much larger proposal. It might be that that was the object which the Government had in view. The reason of the closuring by compartments proposal was not factious opposition on that side of the House. The only justification for it was that the Government had got their business into such a condition that they had to pass matters through the House practically without discussion. He thought the principle involved was an extremely bad one, and that it destroyed the whole character of the House. He did not suppose there had been one Amendment moved which had not been genuine and conceived with the desire to make the proposals of the Government more workable. He protested against the arbitrary and tyrannical action of the Government in preventing the discussion of questions which seriously affected the business of the House.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he did not think the House realised the very great importance of the duties to be entrusted to the Chairmen of the Standing Committees, under the proposed regulations. He should be sorry to say one word in disparagement of the gentlemen who had filled the Chair in the Standing Committees, and he hoped he should not be acting in a manner showing want of appreciation of their work if he pointed out the great difference in the method of their appointment from that of the Chairman of Ways and Means. If it were proposed to appoint as the Chairman of the Committees of this House a gentleman who was not acceptable, they knew how such a Motion would be dealt with. But the appointment of the Chairman of a Standing Committee was not the act of the Whole House; it was the act of the Committee of Selection, and he could not help thinking that if it came to a case of strain, there might be great difficulty arising out of the fact that the Chairman of a Standing Committee was appointed by the Committee of Selection only. There was this further difficulty. Those who occupied the position of Speaker, or Chairman of Committees, soon gained valuable experience and became more and more influential, but the Chairman of a Standing Committee only occupied his position for a short time. He came and went, and his position was not the same as that of the gentlemen who presided over the House itself. Another objection to the proposed new Rules was the want of publicity in the Standing Committees. When the closure was given in the House it was given before the world. It was given before those who, whether in or out of the House, criticised their proceedings. But the closure when applied by the Chairmen of these Committees would be deprived of the benefit of publicity which was so great a guarantee for safety and impartiality. He was perfectly sure that as time went on the importance of these arguments would be appreciated. In regard to Wales, he was not sure that a Bill for the Disestablisment and Disendowment of the Church in Wales was exclusively Welsh business, because the Welsh dioceses were not coincident with any of the English counties. Where a Welsh Disestablisment Bill was discussed years ago that was the great difficulty. If it was a great difficulty then, it would become an impossibility now under the proposed Standing Order, because a Motion with reference to the Welsh Church would not be exclusively Welsh business. He looked with the greatest apprehension on this principle of what he would venture to term disintegration. What he desired to see continued was the United Kingdom—united in sympathy, in policy, and in future prospects. He looked with the greatest dread on these proposals, however innocent they might seem at first sight—proposals which would involve separation in their administrative and legislative business of one part of the country after another, instead of securing a united whole. He deprecated in the strongest manner the idea of disintegration and separation, regarding it as not respectful to the House.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) rose to continue the debate.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 306; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 115.)

AYES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William

Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.(Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lever, A.Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeagh,Charles(Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W,
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mp'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E,

Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(South'mpt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J. (CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher,Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Gov'n
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(EdinburghW.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley GeorgeD.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker,Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, "That these words be there inserted."

House divided:—Ayes, 89; Noes, 306. (Division List No. 116.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J. (CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A.(Worc
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewish'm)
Cochrane, Hon.Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James (Down,E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark,Gov'n
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount

Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Laurence Hardy and Mr. Evelyn Cecil.

NOES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, R'mf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington

Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. L.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon. N
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpton
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. EVELYN CECIL said he desired to move, in line 2, after the word "shall" to insert the words "be taken on Tuesday," and the consequential Amendment, in line 4, to leave out "Tuesday, the 16th day of April," in order to insert, "Wednesday, the 17th day of April." His object was to give effect to the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition that an additional day should be given for the discussion of the more important features of the Closure Resolution. He did not think that many words ought to be needed to commend this course to the House, because sufficient latitude of time ought to be given to hon. Members to enable them adequately to discuss the many important questions which were raised by the new Rules. Not the least important of these was whether hon. Members were to be allowed to speak more than once on the Report stage of Bills which came down from Grand Committees. Unless that privilege were allowed, he believed that it would lead to the prolongation instead of the shortening of debate.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.), in moving the rejection of the Bill, said that as one who had been Deputy-Chairman of the London County Council he deeply regretted to oppose it. He naturally felt regret because of the changed character of the London County Council, and its new political complexion. It might be asked what his reasons were for opposing the Bill. He noticed a statement in *The Times* a few days ago stating that Mr. Boland had been notified by the London County Council of their intention to withdraw from the Bill the clause to which Roman Catholic Members took exception, empowering the police to visit Roman Catholic institutions where lodgings were provided for the poor and destitute, and that the Nationalists would not persist in their opposition when the measure came before the House of Commons for Second Reading. Such an announcement was full of interest at the present time. It threw a good deal of light upon the claims the Roman Catholic Church were now making upon the London County Council. It recalled Lord Beaconsfield's famous saying—

> "I know your Church—you plead for tolerance, but you ask for supremacy."

The clause to which reference was made was Clause 85 which ran as follows—

> "No premises within the county shall be deemed to be exempt from the provisions of the Common Lodging Houses Act, 1851 and 1853, as amended by the London County Council (General Powers) Act, 1902, or part 9 referring to the Common Lodging Houses of the last-mentioned Act or by any Act amending the said Act in which persons are harboured or lodged not for hire for a period not exceeding a week at a time."

He did not wish to say one word against the good work that was done by members of the Roman Catholic Church among the poor outcasts of London. There were many good and earnest men engaged in such work, but he could not help asking why this secrecy was wanted on the part of the Roman Catholics. If there was nothing to conceal, why endeavour to conceal it? The Bill dealt with a very large number of issues, and he thought the House was entitled to a full declaration and explanation in order to make clear what these mysterious arrangements between the County Council and the Roman Catholics really meant. He had worked hard for many years for the party who now governed the County Council, and no one rejoiced more than he at the victory of the Moderate Party, but he could imagine no means better calculated to make the people out of touch with the London County Council than any surrender such as this to a Church, which claimed to dictate to the London County Council, and more often to the people of England as a whole. Where it was based on a claim for tolerance and equality of treatment, they were prepared to grant it, but he thought it was an episode in the history of the County Council that required explanation. He moved that the Bill be read that day six months.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) seconded the Motion, but said he opposed the Bill on broader grounds than the hon. Member for West Down because it seemed to him on looking through the Bill that if it had been necessary to have Clause 85 inserted, there should be some reasonable explanation of why it was being dropped. He could not see why the words referring to the various statutes dealing with common lodging-houses should not be retained in Section 85 as originally set out in the Bill. He agreed that nearly all the safeguards laid down were safeguards which ought to be made applicable to the Bill before the House. If hon. Members would look at the sections of the old Act as regarded common lodging-houses and the precautions to be taken he thought that not one of them would say that any hardship would be inflicted if this provision were retained. Therefore some explanation should be forthcoming as to why the most valuable terms of the old Act were not to be made applicable to this Bill. It was a matter of the greatest importance, and ought to be cleared up. At present it looked as if there was something more than appeared on the surface.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. L. T. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) thought that on this occasion his hon. friend the Member for North Down had tumbled upon a *nidus equinus* or mare's nest, and he could assure him that his suspicion that those who were responsible for the omission of this clause showed any trace of sectarianism was without any foundation whatever. They had left out this clause because there was a very widespread and general opposition to it, not from one Roman Catholic society, but from a large number of Church of England societies. He thought he was right in saying that six societies petitioned against the clause, and only one was Roman Catholic, the rest being Church of England bodies. Those responsible for the Church of England Homes for Waifs and Strays protested against Clause 85. They did not object to the homes being inspected by the Local Government Board or the Home Office, but it was submitted that they should not be inspected by the County Council except for purposes of sanitation and the provision for escape from fire. They were at present inspected for those two purposes by the London County Council. If this clause was retained a good deal of pecuniary liability would be inflicted upon these charitable societies, who did an immense amount of good work in giving shelter at night to poor people who had no place of their own to go to. The County Council felt that at the present moment they did not wish to rush into hasty legislation which might inflict a deadly blow on these societies, Church of England and Roman Catholic alike, which had done so much to help the poor in the past; they desired to to wait until the whole bearing of the question had been considered. The Parliamentary Committee of the County Council now in power had not had time to consider and decide on this complicated Bill, and the House ought to realise that it was not for any sectarian motive that they now asked that the consideration of this clause should be postponed, but for the reason he had given and that reason alone.

*MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) said he found himself in the curious situation, as an old member of the County Council, of asking the House to pass this Bill, whilst the hon. Gentleman who was a member of the party now in power on the County Council was heading an attack on the General Powers Bill as modified by the present Parliamentary Committee of that body. The Bill now before the House was not the Bill it pretended to be. The new County Council had seen fit to omit a number of its provisions, but he would not ask the House to refuse a Second Reading because some provisions with which he was in perfect agreement were dropped. He regretted that Clauses 32 to 51 (excepting Clause 38) had been dropped, and he regretted that Clause 84 had been deleted; with regard to Clause 85 the action of the County Council was perfectly reasonable. Clause 85 practically altered the law of the land in a way that was bound to give considerable offence to many people who held strict views in regard to benevolent institutions. It was surely undesirable to alter the law of the land in favour of a municipal authority in a matter which excited such a strong feeling in the minds of many people in this country, and that was why he considered the authorities at Spring Gardens were perfectly right in not pressing the subject. Some of the clauses in the Bill, however, were absolutely necessary for the improvement of London. They were clauses relating more or less to matters of internal economy. One was to amend the superannuation fund, to make it easier for the County Council to hand over to the relatives of those who died the money due to them under the superannuation scheme. The whole of the Bill, with the exception of Clause 85, was practically non-controversial, and therefore he asked the House to give it a Second Reading.

*SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) desired to emphasise the fact that this was not a Roman Catholic question at all, but a question which affected all charitable institutions, who were much grieved at the way they were to be treated under the clauses that were now dropped. He was able to speak with authority as a member of the committee of the Refuge and Reformatory Union, whose record of service in rescue and educational work all over the country extended over fifty years. On their behalf he heartily supported the proposal that additional time should be given to consider this question. It was one that should be dealt with in some way, but not in the way proposed in Clause 85, which had now been dropped.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he would be the very last person to wish to subject any philanthropic institution to the inspection of the County Council, but he wished to say on the general principle that the Bill as printed was not the Bill that the House was asked to consider. The hon. Member who moved its Second Reading admitted that. He would not say in what way it was altered although he admitted that Clause 85 was withdrawn. So far as he could gather there was some arrangement in regard to other clauses. He did not object to those arrangements nor had he any objection to the Bill being modified in any way its promoters desired, but he did object to being asked to vote for a Bill blindfold.

* MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.), as one whose name was on the back of the Bill, desired to say that he cordially associated himself with what had been said by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Honiton Division of Devon. Part 5 of the Bill was left out, and it had been decided to leave out Part 6 together with Clauses 84 and 85. While efficient inspection of some kind was necessary, he thought it was wise on this occasion to avoid, if possible, hurting the feelings of those who did excellent work in connection with charitable institutions. It was not the feelings of only one section of the Christian community that had been hurt but of many sections, including the Church of England. He therefore associated himself with those who desired to drop Clause 85.

* MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he desired to associate himself most heartily with those who supported the decision to withdraw Clauses 84 and 85, but he really rose for the purpose of asking the sympathy of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board for a class of persons whose interests appeared to have been overlooked in Clause 64 which dealt with superannuation. Under the London School Board there was connected with the teachers a superannuation fund to which they contributed. When the London County Council took over the work of the School Board the superannuation fund was still continued, but it was not allowed that new teachers should become members of the old superannuation fund. The result had been that the remaining members of the original fund naturally found that they were becoming older every year and were becoming an increasing burden on the shrinking fund. If the County Council allowed the members of the original fund to come in under their scheme, and provision might be made under Section 64 to enable that to be done, then what appeared to be a very grave wrong would be removed. Under the present arrangement, unless those who died off were allowed to be replaced by those who were coming on — the new teachers — necessarily the original funds must be entirely cleared out, and those who were not allowed to come in under Clause 64, but only allowed to appeal to the previous existing fund, now being ruined, ran the risk of losing the benefit which they ought to have obtained from continuous contributions spread over a considerable number of years. If this subject might have the consideration of the President of the Local Government Board, he was sure that a suggestion to the London County Council would be all that was required, and the chance of this grave wrong being continued would, he thought, at once pass away.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) said Clauses 84 and 85 no doubt had been put in the Bill by the County Council to meet an existing grievance, and apparently it was not a question of whether the Clause was right or wrong, but one of expediency. He did not know whether they were acting out of sympathy with regard to these charitable institutions, some of them Roman Catholic, in reference to which appeals were coming from all sides at present. The question was whether it was a just thing from the point of view of the inmates of these institutions to exclude these clauses. The hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had said that other clauses were to be deleted. He understood that they were going to pass the Bill as a whole. If the Bill got the Second Reading that night it would be read with the clauses in it, and the deleting of Clauses 84 and 85, with others, would take place in Committee. He would like to know whether the deleting of the clauses was for the purpose of making the Bill more suitable for its objects, or whether it was intended for the gratification of Members of the Opposition. If every Member of the House could negotiate with the County Council in regard to Bills which they promoted and say, "If you do not take out such and such a clause we will oppose it," then they would not know where they stood. He was sure that the Local Government Board would not allow that course to be followed, or if the right hon. Gentleman at the head of that Department did so his opinion with regard to him would be very much changed. When the right hon. Gentleman was on that side of the House, he noticed that one of the things he very often protested against was interference with the rights of the County Council. It was for the London County Council to satisfy the House that there was a further reason for deleting these clauses than the gratification of the hon. Member for Kerry or the satisfaction of the Nationalist Party. If they proved that the inmates of these places were going to be better cared for without supervision and inspection, he thought the House might accept that assurance. It was not fair to ask the House to give the Bill a Second Reading with certain clauses in it, and that the Bill should then go to Committee where those clauses would be deleted, so that the measure which came from Committee would not be that to which they had given a Second Reading. He asked the right hon. Gentleman seriously to consider the matter, and not to consent to it because of a threatened opposition from any part of the House.

LORD R. CECIL said he had been informed by the promoters of the Bill what line they desired to take about it. On every private Bill it was essential that the promoters should negotiate with opponents where they thought those opponents were justified in their opposition. They must be ready, of course, in Committee, to frame the Bill in such a way as on the whole would meet the objects they had in view. They had to consider the Bill as a whole, and they had told certain opponents they intended to strike out this particular clause and other clauses to meet the objections that had been made. Of course, this clause had nothing to do with Roman Catholics especially; the Church of England and Nonconformists desired the exclusion of the clause, but not because they objected to inspection at all. They had no objection to inspection, but they objected to the form of inspection proposed. They thought it was not the right form of inspection to treat these refuges as if they were common lodging-houses, and that to ask a certain kind of inspector to inspect these refuges as lodging-houses would lead to injustice and render the work exceedingly difficult to carry out, while it would cast an unnecessary slur upon the institutions concerned.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Are they willing to accept any kind of inspection whatever?

LORD R. CECIL said he was not in a position to speak for them all. He understood that in the case of those with which he had made himself acquainted, they were perfectly willing to have a suitable form of inspection. The County Council had this opposition to deal with, and having a very complicated measure to prepare in a very short time, they had come to the conclusion that it would be better to drop the clause, at any rate for the present, in order that the matter might be reconsidered and dealt with in the future in a more satisfactory way. It was only right to say that the County Council had shown themselves very zealous and hard-working in dealing with this Bill, discussing all its clauses and informing themselves thoroughly, as they had done, as to the provisions of the measure.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 203; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 117.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W, Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brace, William
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clynes, J. R.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Forster, Henry William
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gilhooly, James
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N,
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
McVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, .N)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Runciman, Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitchapel)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitely, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander

Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Ashley and Mr. Cleland.

NOES.

Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Black, Arthur W.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Clough, William
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haddock, George R.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hyde, Clarendon
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Renton, Major Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. T. L. Corbett and Mr. Sloan.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill read a second time, and committed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE) (TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS THEREON).

Postponed Proceedings on Question, "That the Proceedings on the Motions with respect to Business of the House (Procedure) shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion on Tuesday, the 16th day of April, in the following manner, and subject to the following provisions:—1. At 10 p.m. on that day, Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith the Question on any Amendment or other Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments or other Motions moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but on no other Amendment or Motion), and on any other Question necessary to dispose of the proceedings to be concluded; 2. On that day the proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House; 3. On that day no dilatory Motion, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate; 4. Any opposed Private Business which has been set down for consideration on that day shall stand adjourned without Question put until such other day as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine,"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman,*)—resumed.

Question again proposed.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL, continuing his speech in support of his Amendment giving an additional day to the discussion, said that a good many additional reasons had already been brought forward why the Government should allow a little more time for the discussion of the proposed Rules. They had not yet discussed the important question whether an hon. Member should be allowed to speak more than once upon the Report Stage, although the Prime Minister had promised that concession. Instead of carrying out his promise, the Prime Minister had put down an Amendment which practically limited the right of speaking more than once to the Member in charge of the Bill. He considered that the Government had approached very near to a breach of faith in the matter, and that was one of the reasons why they should be allowed more time. They had been discussing for some time the Question of allotting Grand Committees to different portions of the United Kingdom, and if the Resolution were adopted that policy of disintegration would be forced through without a semblance of discussion. There were other objections to the course pursued by the Government. One was the want of publicity which would necessarily attend the discussion of Bills in Grand Committees, for those discussions would take place with far less publicity than if they were discussed in a Committee of the House. They had not been told what would happen to the Bills committed to Grand Committees.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire), on a point of order, asked if the hon. Member was speaking to the terms of his Amendment.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. Member is arguing that more time should be allowed. Of course, it will not be in order to discuss the various questions for which he is asking for more time.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) asked if the hon. Member was in order in discussing questions which had already been settled by a vote of the House?

MR. EVELYN CECIL said he was simply enumerating reasons why he thought more time ought to be given to the discussion of the proposed Rules, and he thought he had given three or four very good reasons. He wished to know were the Grand Committees to remain sitting during the ordinary sittings of the House? That was a point which required elucidation. None of the questions he had mentioned could be discussed if the Resolution passed as it stood. Therefore they naturally desired that more time should be given. He was not asking for very much. His Amendment merely asked half a day, Wednesday night being a private Members' night. There was nothing extravagant in his proposal, and it was one that offered some ground for compromise. The Prime Minister himself had said he regretted that they had not in this Parliament been able to make "deals" between the two sides as before. Why did not the Government consent to some arrangement? The perpetual determination not to give way or to make any "deal" on questions of this kind was necessarily a source of irritation and unpleasantness, and generally in the long run it could not fail to have the effect of making opposition to the Government proposals more bitter and more strenuous. It was for that reason that he pleaded with the Government to accept his Amendment. He thought it would remove a good deal of bitterness and unpleasantness. The House would then have an opportunity of discussing the important questions he had mentioned, and they would be in better humour with each other, perhaps, for the greater part of the session. He thought the Government had plenty of time. It was understood that the Government had dropped the Licensing Bill. They had to all intents and purposes dropped the Irish University Bill. Two highly controversial measures had, therefore, been removed from the list of Bills to be passed this session. Perhaps he might even say it had been rumoured that there was to be no Home Rule Bill. At any rate, there would be considerable time at the disposal of the Government if they were going to devote the rest of the session to the disintegration of the Army and the destruction of the landlords. There would be nothing like the pressure on the time of the House which certainly there would have been if they had introduced those other Bills. He thought it would be a good omen for the discussion of the measures they intended to proceed with if they would grant the moderate request for half a day more to discuss what were really non-Party matters affecting the procedure of the House.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment. He said that when he addressed a few remarks to the House earlier in the afternoon, he was singularly fortunate in having the pleasure and the honour of being listened to by the President of the Board of Education. That was about five o'clock, and the right hon. Gentleman was then the only occupant of the Treasury Bench, and now at twenty minutes past nine the right hon. Gentleman was still there. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to occupy the position of maid of all work to the Government. He did not criticise the capability of the right hon.

Gentleman to fill that or any other position, but he rose to call attention to the absence of the Prime Minister. This was the most important question that had been before the House in this generation. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] He was surprised to hear that laughter. The new rules were designed to stifle free discussion. One of the reasons why the Opposition asked for further discussion was that the proposals would put still greater powers in the hands of the Executive, and he would remind the House that on 6th February, 1902, when new Rules of Procedure were then being discussed, the Prime Minister said—

> "We must take care that we do not, wittingly or unwittingly, exalt the power of the Executive and diminish the control of the House at large. Facilitate the progress of business as much as you like; make it as reasonable and as easy as you like; but do not do anything which will have the effect of placing the House of Commons more and more at the mercy of the Government of the day."

They wanted more time to discuss these Rules in order to get assurances from the Government that they did not intend to violate the excellent principles laid down by the right hon. Gentleman. One of the reasons why the right hon. Gentleman would not give an extra half-day was that he knew perfectly well that he and his friends were unable to answer the arguments advanced by the Opposition. He felt sure that the right hon. Gentleman, in view of the words which he had just quoted, would assent to the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Amendment proposed—

> "In line 2, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'be taken on Tuesday and.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR HENRY CRAIK appealed to the Prime Minister to consider whether he could not make this concession. He had no doubt there were good reasons for the absence of the Prime Minister from so important a debate, but he would point out that certain grave inconvenience arose from his absence. Arguments were addressed to the Front Bench and especially to the Prime Minister, and in his absence they were entirely overlooked, or when he came in at occasional intervals he spoke without the slightest regard to the fact that those arguments had been advanced. The small Amendment which his hon. friend had proposed would give them a little time for the discussion of the important proposal for the setting up a special Scottish Standing Committee. The Prime Minister had said that there was practically unanimity in Scotland in favour of the proposal, but he absolutely denied that.

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER said that the question whether or not there was unanimity in favour of the proposal was not now under discussion.

SIR HENRY CRAIK remarked that in an Amendment of the same character the Prime Minister was allowed to use the argument of unanimity; but he maintained that there was no such unanimity, and a longer time was required to discuss the matter which ought not to be passed *sub silentio* to-morrow. The Prime Minister had also stated that the new Rule was practically the Resolution passed in 1894 and 1895. If the right hon. Gentleman had taken the trouble to be present during the debate, he would have heard that argument refuted. The Resolutions passed in 1894 and 1895 were merely Sessional Orders.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said the hon. Member must confine himself to the matter as it affected the question of allowing an additional half day.

SIR HENRY CRAIK contended that he had a right to show that it was not a fair argument to limit the time for the discussion of the new Rule that there was absolute unanimity in Scotland, and that it was identical with the Resolutions passed in 1894 and 1895 [MINISTERIAL cries of "Order"]; and he was not going to be stopped by a dozen Deputy Chairmen on the other side.

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was again disregarding his ruling, and he must ask him to keep to the Question before the House.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said he bowed to the Deputy Speaker's ruling. He was not entitled, as he understood, to bring forward these arguments in refutation of the arguments used by the Prime Minister. He considered that the demand pressed upon the Government was a very moderate one, which, if there was any desire to meet the legitimate claims of Scotland, ought certainly to be conceded.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he desired to support the Amendment for reasons entirely different from those given by the last speaker. The power of closure and of consequential closure to be given to the Chairmen of Grand Committees would, under the arrangement proposed by the Government, be sanctioned without discussion, although it was the most important point that yet remained to be debated. There was a further Amendment on the point of which he had given notice, but which he supposed would be defeated. It seemed to him that the Chairmen of Grand Committees had already ample powers of closure, without this further power of closuring consequential Amendments. They could always rely on the Speaker and Deputy Speaker to take a fair and reasonable view as to when consequential closure might be allowed; but they should not give to the five or six Chairmen of the Grand Committees, who were Party men, and had not the same exalted position as the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, the power to rule out of discussion whole pages of Amendments. He objected, as an independent Member, to this great power of consequential closure being conferred upon any Party man who perhaps expected to be appointed as a Charity Commissioner for the manner in which he had carried out his duties as a Chairman of a Grand Committee.

MR. PIRIE said that although he was a sufferer himself from the fact that matters affecting Scotland might not be fully discussed, he wished to protest against the exhibition of dilatory tactics on the other side, by which hours had been wasted that might have been devoted to the discussion of matters in which the whole House was really interested.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 83; Noes, 294. (Division List, No. 118.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. L. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Linoel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid).
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Sir Henry Craik.

Sir Henry Craik.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Afred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurt, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund E. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)

Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M.(Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G,
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D.(Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A.(Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin(East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W.(Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R.(Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,Sir John L.(Leeds,S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick(Meath,North)
Whitley, John Henry(Halifax
Whittaker, Sir ThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Willams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Cramarth'n
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson,J.H.(Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson,P.W.(St.Pancras,S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 289; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 119.)

AYES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A.Acland(Christchurch
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John(Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R.(Essex,Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen(Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William(Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell(Bris
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur(Edinburgh,S.
Duncan,C(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A.Edward(Camborne
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch(Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G.(Peterborough
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A.(Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh

Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A.G.C.(Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis(Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold(Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Carendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W.(Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, AlfredJohn(Knutsford
Laidlow, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever,W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt.Hon.David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald,J.M.(Flkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal,E.
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Killop, W.
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien,Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E. B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,WalterRussell(Scarboro'
Redmond,John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick,B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,SirJohnL.(Leeds,S.)
Ward,John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.
Beach,Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George

Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingham
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law,AndrewBonar(Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos.Myles
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Motions with respect to Business of the House (Procedure) shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion on Tuesday, the 16th day of April, in the following manner, and subject to the following provisions :—1. At ten p.m. on that day, Mr. SPEAKER shall put forthwith the Question or any Amendment or other Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments or other Motions moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but on no other Amendment or Motion), and on any other Question necessary to dispose of the Proceedings to be concluded; 2. On that day the proceedings to which this Order relates shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House; 3. On that day no dilatory Motion, nor Motion for Adjournnent under Standing Order No. 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate; 4. Any opposed Private Business which has been set down for consideration on that day shall stand adjourned without Question put until such other day as the Chairman of Ways and Means may determine.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [11th April] to Question [20th March]—"(1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to—(a) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills; or (b) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall, without further debate, put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, '(*c*) Bills dealing with the organisation of the Army or Reserve Forces, or with the Navy.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN desired to ask the Prime Minister if he would inform the House of the principle upon which the Government had founded their proposed Standing Order. They had made particular exceptions. He excluded from the Bills automatically sent upstairs unless the House otherwise ordered on division Bills imposing taxes and certain small Bills. Bills imposing taxation was the important exception. The particular exception they were now asked to make was as to Bills in regard to the Army. He asked the Government why they thought it necessary to retain finance Bills in the House and to refuse to retain Army Bills. He shared the view of his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition that their financial procedure was unnecessarily cumbrous, and that a good deal of it was explicable by our past history. It had no practical reference to our present circumstances. The special jealousy with which the House regarded their financial Bills, and the special safeguards with which they had hedged about their passage, were really the outcome of the time when the House of Commons depended upon its power in two respects—in the first place, its power over money and grants to the Crown; and, in the second place, its power over the armed forces of the Crown. Any student of history would bear him out when he said that the House of Commons in those days regarded with equal jealousy any permanent grant of money to the Crown and any Bill authorising the Crown to maintain a land force or military disciplined force. In those days the jealousy of the House was maintained with regard to both the Army and finance. But the present Government maintained all the jealousy with regard to finance, but did not apply it to the Army. If he remembered aright the Army Bill in its preamble began by saying: "It is inexpedient to maintain and contrary to law," and that the powers should be only annual. They were ready to hedge about their financial system with safeguards; why should they be justified in abandoning the same safeguards in regard to military matters? He really asked the question with a desire for information. He had had, as it happened, to do with their financial procedure, though he had had little to do with the Army, except that for a short time he had to find the money to pay for it. He was quite at a loss to conceive any reason for retaining all the safeguards in regard to finance Bills, which did equally apply to Bills dealing with the Army. Therefore he desired to know what distinction the Government drew between the two. Bearing in mind that finance Bills of considerable importance might be brought in dealing with a considerable amount of details, it might be of great interest to future Chancellors of the Exchequer to know what determined the Government at the present time to preserve for finance Bills a series of restrictions which they did not think necessary in the case of any other Bills.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he certainly thought that other people required some enlightenment as well as the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He required some as to the view taken by the right hon. Gentleman and his friends. Now it appeared that they were doubtful whether there should be any particular sanctity in money Bills. Last week when they were discussing the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool, the right hon. Gentleman thought that the Government's proposal for the safeguarding of money Bills was not strong enough. Now the Government were asked why they preserved these obsolete and out-of-date precautions.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is not what I said. I asked the Government what was the logic of their distinction. I have logic of my own, but I cannot discover any logic in their proposal.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman said a good deal more. He said that for his part he doubted whether these rules as to money Bills were necessary at all.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I spoke of Resolutions.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, no; the right hon. Gentleman spoke of their treating them as if they were in a separate category altogether. That had always been done. That was the rule of the House. The Hartington Committee, in 1886, recommended—

"That every public Bill, after the Second Reading, except a Bill originating in Committee of Ways and Means, or a Bill for the Confirmation of any Provisional Order, unless the House shall otherwise order, shall be referred to a Standing Committee of the Whole House."

Among the members of that Committee were Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Courtney, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Healy, Mr. Justin McCarthy, Sir John Mowbray, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. W. H. Smith. It was a formidable list of names. Therefore, the Government also thought it was a reasonable thing to exempt these Bills. Now, it was asked, why not make a similar exemption of Army Bills? He did not remember that, in the early seventies, when there was a great reform of the Army, the Army Bills were treated in an exceptional manner. He did not know any particular reason why such a Bill should not be sent to a Standing Committee, but if there were such a reason, the House could refuse to send the Bill upstairs. Every Bill must stand on its own footing, but there was no sufficient ground for saying that every measure connected with the Army must be exempt from the ordinary procedure adopted for other Bills. He had answered the questions put by the right hon Gentleman as fully as he could, and he did not think there was much force in the point he sought to make, that if money Bills were exempt Army Bills should be exempt as well.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the only reason given by the Prime Minister for drawing a distinction as to these Bills was that a similar line of distinction had been drawn by the Hartington Committee. But the Hartington Committee did not take any pains when they had the power to turn their Report into an actuality, and some of the most important recommendations of that Committee were being rejected by the Government. Nothing in the nature of a reason had been given by the Prime Minister as to why the distinction between money Bills and Army Bills had been drawn, and what the Opposition pressed for was a reason for the plan of the Government. Surely that was not a very strange request. The Opposition denied the proposition that the distinction should be made because money Bills were important and other Bills were not. But it was not on the point of importance that the exception was made. Could it be on the point of constitutional precedent? If that was the reason, then the sanctity which attached to money Bills also attached to Bills dealing with the forces of the Crown. If the Government contended that in regard to money Bills they were justified in putting them into this exceptional category, they had a right to ask what was the reason for this exception and why it should not include other very important matters, one of which they were now discussing, and another of which it would be their duty to discuss immediately. He appealed to every hon. Member who had heard the Prime Minister's speech to say whether the right hon. Gentleman had given a single reason for the exception which he intended to introduce which did not apply with equal force to other measures. He would leave the House to judge whether there had been a complete reply, or any attempt to reply to the arguments which had been put forward by the Opposition.

*MR. ABEL SMITH said they had been told that they were wasting the time of the House in discussing such an Amendment as this. What they were trying to impress upon the Government was that in these revolutionary changes in the Rules of Procedure they should at least be consistent. If it was right to make an exception in the case of Bills imposing taxation, why was it not equally right that exceptions should be made in the case of Bills dealing with the forces of the Crown? His hon. friends had pointed out that these two classes of Bills had almost equal historic sanction. They knew how jealous the House had always been with regard to its powers over the finances of the nation. They also knew that ever since there had been a Standing Army, as now understood in this country, the House had always exercised equal jealousy over its control of that force. Now the Government proposed to make a revolutionary change. They were sweeping away what the Prime Minister called archaic safeguards. If they made exceptions with regard to Bills dealing with the finances of the country, they ought also to make exceptions with regard to Bills dealing with the Standing Army, over the strength, finance, and discipline of which the House had always maintained a substantial and annual control.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 96; Noes, 301. (Division List No. 120.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHnSir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A.J. (CityLond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ. A. (Worc
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, Geroge William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert, (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H (Essex, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J, R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh.
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-s.
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles; E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)

Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J.
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor. John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseeph
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset)
Torrence, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, S. D.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patcick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he wished to move the exception of Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom; Bills to give effect to treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements; and Bills to sanction the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown. There were no reasons in favour of the exemption of finance Bills that would not equally apply to the three categories he had mentioned, and, notwithstanding any impatience the Prime Minister and his supporters might display, it was desirable that the Amendment should be moved in order that the Opposition might be able to mark their sense of the imperfections and reckless character of the Government Resolutions. Except by moving this Amendment the Opposition would have no way of getting a permanent record of their protest. As to the first category, Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom, such Bills did not fall within the class of those which took away or modified the powers of this House. In all Home Rule Bills, there was invariably the Pharisaical claim that there was a complete reservation of the most absolute powers of the House. But if the Second Reading of such a Bill was assented to and it was sent upstairs to Grand Committee there would be no effective reservation at all. As to the second category, of Bills to give effect to treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements, right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite would, without such an exception, have sent the Sugar Convention Bill to a Grand Committee upstairs; and under the class of Bills which sanctioned the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown, they would have sent to a Committee upstairs the Bill sanctioning the cession of the island of Heligoland to Germany. When the last named Bill was under discussion the late Mr. Gladstone delivered a most powerful address to the House in favour of the view that such matters should not be submitted to Parliament by Bill but if such subjects were to be dealt with by Parliament it ought to be by the House as a whole. He would remind the Prime Minister and those responsible for the new Standing Orders that none of them made it in any way compulsory to keep to be dealt within the House itself Bills which came within any one of the three classes he had mentioned. There would always be a power to submit the familiar Motion to send such Bills to a Committee upstairs unless an Amendment of this kind were agreed to. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at end, to add '(c) Bills relating to the maintenance, organisation, or discipline of the Navy or the naval service; (d) Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom; (e) Bills to give effect to treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements; (f) Bills to sanction the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown.' "—(*Mr. Stuart Wortley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

CAPTAIN CRAIG said that the Prime Minister earlier in the evening had stated that, if the Opposition had taken the opportunity which was given to them on Thursday last of casting their eyes upon the various Amendments upon the Paper and selecting those which were most vital, this guillotine Motion would not have been necessary. Following that advice, he thought that the most vital Amendment was that which excluded from the consideration of the Grand Committees, Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom. He looked with the greatest possible dread upon Bills of that character being taken away from the Committee of the Whole House. Of course he had in his mind the case of Ireland, and it was in view of the conflicting statements which had been made from time to time from the Treasury Bench that he had no doubt the Prime Minister and the Cabinet contemplated that a number of Bills of this character would be brought before the House for consideration. He believed, however, if it was the intention of the Prime Minister and his Government to lay the foundation stone of Home Rule for Ireland by introducing such a Bill and sending it upstairs to a Grand Committee, where those who were interested might or might not be represented in the proportion which they would like to see, they would inflict the gravest possible injury on the Committee work of the House. He had always endeavoured since he entered the House, however imperfectly, to voice the sentiments fairly and squarely of those who returned him, and if this proposal were carried a great deal of the power of representation and many of the privileges which one was supposed to enjoy would be taken away. If Bills of such tremendous purport and moment were permitted to go to a Grand Committee upstairs, where debate was not conducted in the same manner as in the House and where the light of day would not, so to speak, be admitted, hon. Members would not be able to realise as a whole what was being done and how it was being one. He was strengthened in that view by the fact that he learned from various Ministers that it was their intention to introduce legislation which closely affected the people of Ireland. The Prime Minister had stated that it was their intention to introduce very shortly a measure dealing with what he called "the better government of Ireland," or in other words "the association of the people of Ireland with the management of their affairs." If it was the intention of the Government to pass that Bill through without allowing hon. members a fair opportunity of discussing it, he thought it would be a crying shame. Such a policy must inevitably rebound on the heads of those Members of the Government who had engineered this method of dealing with business to the disadvantage of the minority in the House. He was glad, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman had moved this particular Amendment which he claimed exhibited great common sense and reasonableness.

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

NEW BILLS.

NURSES AND PRIVATE NURSING HOMES (REGISTRATION).

Bill to provide for the better Training and Registratien of Nurses and for the voluntary Registration of Private Nursing Homes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Claude Hay and Sir Arthur Bignold.

NURSES AND PRIVATE NURSING HOMES (REGISTRATION) BILL.

"To provide for the better Training and Registration of Nurses and for the voluntary Registration of Private Nursing Homes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 157.]

ADJOURNMENT—EFFECT OF NEW RULES ON EXISTING STANDING COMMITTEES.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the House do now adjourn.—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether, at the conclusion of the debate on the proposal to substitute four new Standing Committees for the existing Standing Committees at ten o'clock to-morrow night, the existing Standing Committees would be automatically abolished. One of those Standing Committees was dealing with the feeding of school children, and was to meet to-morrow. He would be glad to know what was the position of the existing Committees and of the Bills before them. It seemed to be absurd that a Committee should meet and attempt to do work on the very eve of their demise.

MR. HALDANE replied that in the Standing Orders there were no words relating to the deposition of Committees. It could only be a *de facto* supersession, and they might pass resolutions as they liked, but, until the Committee of Selection or some other body had set up these new Committees, there was no *de facto* abolition of the existing machinery, therefore the old machinery went on.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said these Committees were not formally abolished, but the contemplated effect of the new Standing Order was to abolish them. He would like to have the view of the Speaker as to the actual *status* of the old Committees, as to how the work of the old Committees could be carried on by the new Committees, and as to how a Bill which had been before an old Committee could be suddenly transferred to a new Committee.

MR. HALDANE asked the Speaker's opinion whether until the new Committees were *de facto* set up the old Committees had ceased to exist.

*MR. SPEAKER said he was really not in a position to answer the question. If the right hon. Gentleman would repeat his question to-morrow, he would endeavour by that time to arrive at a solution.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he should never have thought of raising this question without some previous reference to Mr. Speaker or the Government, but the point was only brought to his attention a few minutes before.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked whether it would be in order for a Committee to disregard the Order of the House, and whether these Committees would not remain in existence until they had completed the work which had been sent to them by the House.

MR. STANLEY WILSON said there were two Grand Committees now in existence, the Committee on Law and the Committee on Trade, each consisting of eighty members, and yet the Government intended to set up four new Grand Committees which would absorb another 320 Members. He would like Mr. Speaker to consider what would be the feelings of Members who were nominated on these new Grand Committees.

*MR. SPEAKER said he did not think that question came before him. The question was whether the work of the Standing Committees was to be continued by the new Committees which were about to be set up or whether the Resolution of the House to-morrow would put an end to the old Committees. As he had said, he would consider the matter, and if the right hon. Gentleman would put his Question to-morrow at Question time he would give him the best Answer he could.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at a quarter after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 16*th April*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1); London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market).

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—Electric Supply Corporation [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn.

Devonport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [H.L.]; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Tees Conservancy Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Byrne's Divorce Bill [H.L.]; Galwey's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Byrne's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Minutes of evidence and proceedings before this House on the Second Reading, together with the documents deposited in the case, returned from the Commons.

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Buckhaven Dock Bill [H.L.]; Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Northbrook be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Weardale; read, and agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for the preliminary instruction of elementary school teachers.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the period from 1st November, 1903, to 31st December, 1905. Vol I., Part 1.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSION ACT, 1865.

Order in Council, dated 26th March, 1907, approving a memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in regard to the pay of men of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve who have qualified in signalling or wireless telegraphy. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

THE STANDING ORDERS.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I ask your Lordships to make an alteration in your Standing Orders to allow interest to be paid during construction of railways at the rate of 4 per cent. instead of 3 per cent. per annum. This alteration in the Standing Orders has already been made in another place. As your Lordships are probably aware, it is very difficult now to raise capital at 3 per cent., and a very strong representation has been made to the authorities in both Houses of Parliament to allow interest at 4 per cent. I beg to move that your Lordships agree to the proposed alteration in the Standing Orders.

Moved, That Standing Order No. 128 be amended as follows:—

[NOTE.—The word in small capitals is to be omitted, and the word printed in Italics is to be inserted.]

128. A clause shall be inserted in every Railway Bill prohibiting the payment of any interest or dividend out of any capital which the company have been or may be authorised to raise, either by means of calls, or of any power of borrowing, to any shareholder on the amount of the calls made in respect of the shares held by him, except such interest on money advanced by any shareholder beyond the amount of the calls actually made as is in conformity with the Companies Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, or the Companies Clauses Consolidation (Scotland)

Act, 1845, as the case may be; and except such interest (if any) as the Committee on the Bill may, according to the circumstances of the case, think fit to allow, subject always to the following conditions:—(1) That the rate of interest allowed by the Committee do not in any case exceed THREE *four* per centum per annum; (2) That interest be allowed to be paid in respect only of the time allowed by the Bill for the completion of the railway, or such less time as the Committee think fit; (3) That payment of interest be not allowed to begin until the Railway Company have deposited with the Board of Trade a statutory declaration by two of the directors and the secretary of the company to the effect that two-thirds at least of the share capital authorised by the Bill, in respect whereof interest may be paid, have been actually issued and accepted, and are held by shareholders, who, or whose executors, administrators, successors, or assigns, are legally liable for the same; (4) That interest do not accrue in favour of any shareholder for any time during which any call on any of his shares is in arrear; (5) That the aggregate amount to be so paid for interest be estimated and stated in the Bill, and be not deemed capital within Standing Order 112; (6) That notice of the company having power so to pay interest out of capital be given in every prospectus, advertisement, or other document of the company inviting subscriptions for shares, and in every certificate of shares; and (7) That the half-yearly accounts of the company do show the amount on which, and the rate at which, interest has been paid. And the company may be authorised by the Bill to pay interest accordingly, but not further or otherwise.—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I ask leave to postpone the Second Reading of this Bill until Monday next. I apologise to any noble Lords who have been inconvenienced by coming down to-day, and I take the opportunity of saying that I shall definitely move the Second Reading on Monday.

Second Reading (which stands appointed for this day) put off to Monday next.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, I do not propose to make any speech in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. There is nothing novel in its character. Certain Amendments have been rendered necessary by the Act of last year, and I have caused a Memorandum to be issued which is now on the Table of your Lordships' House explaining those Amendments. They are all of a drafting, and in some cases of a technical, character, and I do not think I need detain your Lordships further in moving the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 16*th April*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill, as amended, considered; to be read the third time.

London County Council (Money) Bill, "to regulate the expenditure of money by the London County Council on capital account during the current financial period and the raising of money to meet such expenditure; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill, Order [8th April] that the Petition for Additional Provision in the case of the Watford and Edgware Railway Bill be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills read, and discharged. Petition for additional Provision withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the working of mines and minerals under and adjacent to the portion of the Bridgewater Canal extending from Monton Bridge, in the county of Lancaster, to Leigh, in the same county; and for other purposes." [Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to dissolve the Humber Conservancy Commissioners and the Humber Pilotage Commissioners and to incorporate the Humber Conservancy Board; and to confer upon that Board the powers of the Humber Conservancy Commissioners and of the Humber Pilotage Commissioners, certain powers of the Hull Trinity House, the power to levy dues, and other powers; and for other purposes." [Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for an increase of the share capital of Borax Consolidated, Limited, and for the conversion of the ordinary shares of the company into preferred ordinary shares and deferred ordinary shares; and for other purposes." [Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the time for the completion of the authorised pier and works of the Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Company; and for other purposes." [Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to rearrange and increase the capital of, and to alter and extend the Memorandum of Association, and the objects and powers of the Staveley Coal and Iron Company, Limited; and for other purposes." [Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to vary the style or qualification of Licentiates of the Society of Apothecaries of London; and for other purposes." [Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Alderman, and Citizens of the City of Manchester with reference to the constructions of Tramways and street widenings; and for other purposes." [Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill. [Lords.]

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords]; Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]; Society of

Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Granville; Resolven; and, Westleigh Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Aberdeen (two); Arbroath; Buteshire; Hawick; Midlothian; Moray and Nairn; and, Orkney; To lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL OPTION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Aberdeen (two); Dalkeith; Dundee; Hawick; and, Perth; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Aberdeen; Arbroath; Baltasound; Banff (two); Bonnyrigg; Bothwell; Buckhaven; Coldstream; Cranstonhill; Edinburgh (thirteen); Galashiels; Glasgow (three); Grand Lodge of Scotland of the International Order of Good Templars; Greenock; Inverness (two); Inverurie; Johnshaven; Kilbarchan; Laurencekirk; Longhope; Macduff; Morningside (two); Neilston; Park and Polworth; Rothesay; Saltcoats; Selkirk; Stevenston; and, Troon; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Castle Ward, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Stockingford, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of the 26th March, 1907, approving a Memorial of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in regard to the pay of men of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve who have qualified in Signalling or Wireless Telegraphy [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (COMMISSIONS)

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 27th March; *Mr. Pirie*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No 111.]

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the period from 1st November 1903 to 31st December 1905, Vol. 1, Part 1. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

Return ordered, "relating to Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 256, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. J. A. Pease.*)

CLYDE PORTS (VESSELS ENTERING, ETC.)

Return ordered, "of the Vessels which entered and cleared the Clyde Ports, Ardrossan, Ayr, Belfast, Liverpool, and Manchester, for the Ports of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and all

Ports of the Baltic East of the Skaw during the year 1906, both Vessels trading direct and Vessels trading viâ United Kingdom Ports, in the following form :—

Vessels trading direct.

Ports.	Ships entering from tho Ports of						Ships clearing to the Ports of					
	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.
Glasgow (Clyde Ports)...												
Ardrossan												
Ayr												
Belfast												
Liverpool												
Manchester												

Vessels trading viâ United Kingdom Ports.

Ports.	Ships entering from the Ports of							Ships clearing to the Ports of						
	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.	Viâ.	Germany.	Holland.	Norway.	The Baltic.	Denmark.	Total.	Viâ.
Glasgow (Clyde Ports)														
Ardrossan														
Ayr														
Belfast														
Liverpool														
Manchester														

—(*Mr. Ainsworth.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Population of Ireland and Scotland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, having regard to the fact that the population of Ireland has decreased from 8,175,124 in 1841 to 4,387,887 on 30th June, 1906, he can state, for the purposes of comparison, the population of Scotland in 1841 and the estimated population in 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The population of Scotland, as at the Census of 1841, was 2,620,184, and at the middle of the year (30th June) 1906 was estimated at 4,726,070.

Pay and Position of Plumbers in the Navy.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether their Lordships have under consideration the question of the pay and position of the plumbers and plumbers' mates of the Royal Navy; whether he is aware that, as mechanics, their trade is the lowest paid in the Navy; that no increase of pay has been given since the rating of plumber was introduced into His Majesty's service over forty years ago, whilst all other branches have obtained concessions, in some way or other, as regards pay and obtained the rating of chief petty officer; that, by being unable to attain that rating, they are unable to obtain an increase of pay whilst serving and are also debarred from receiving an extra halfpenny per day for that rating on being pensioned; and that they are not in receipt of the 2d. per day granted to some ratings for re-engaging and no progressive pay of any description is granted.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The question of the pay and position of plumbers has been considered in the past, and no reason is seen for its reconsideration at the present time. The rating is among the lowest paid of the artisan class as the work requires less skill than that of the more highly paid classes. The rating was established in 1860, with pay at the rate of 2s. 3d. a day (continuous service); this rate was increased to 2s. 5d. in 1864, and again to 3s. in 1867. It may be mentioned that some of the concessions to other classes have been in the direction of equalising their pay with that of plumbers. There are other ratings who do not rise to chief petty officers, *e.g.*, blacksmiths, coopers, painters. As plumbers do not serve as chief petty officers they are ineligible for the addition to pension which is granted only for service as such. Re-engagement pay of 2d. a day is only given to seamen ratings. Plumbers' mates, being second class petty officers, receive an increase of pay on advancement to the rating of plumber (first class petty officer). They are also eligible for additional pay according to the number of good conduct badges earned.

Comptroller and Auditor General—Pensions and Honours.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state how many Comptroller and Auditor Generals retired on pension during the last thirty years; how many of these received the honour of knighthood whilst actively serving and on retirement on pension respectively; and how many retired on pension without receiving this honour.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Board of Treasury have no information on the points referred to in the hon. Member's Question.

Promotion to Second Division Clerks of Abstractors (Assistant Clerks).

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether abstractors (assistant clerks) who show the necessary qualifications for promotion to the Second Division are entitled to such promotion, according to the regulations under which they enter, after six years' service, including service as boy clerks up to two years; and what is the total length of service, including service as boy clerks up to two years, of each of the six senior abstractors in the Exchequer and Audit Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of the 29th November, 1898, an assistant clerk who has had not less than six years established service may receive, on the recommendation of the head of his department and with the approval of the Treasury, appointment to the Second Division. But the Order directs that such appointments are only to be made upon grounds of merit and in exceptional cases. By a later Order not less than one nor more than two years service as boy clerk may be reckoned. I am informed that none of the six abstractors referred to has had more than four years and four months service.

Government Audit of Irish Public Accounts.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the names of the public accounts in Ireland to which a partial local audit is given in Ireland each year by the Exchequer and Audit Department, the number of officials employed on each account in this local test, and the number of weeks in each year during which each of those officials is so employed.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that the following accounts are subject to a partial local audit in Ireland each year:—Army, Irish Command; Public Works (including Local Loans); Ordnance Survey; Board of Trade; Department of Agriculture; Chief Secretary for Ireland; County Court Officers; Irish Land Commission; Irish Church Temporalities; Congested Districts Board; Reformatory and Industrial Schools; Public Education; Post Office. The time occupied by the examination varies considerably in each case, and the Comptroller and Auditor General is not prepared to furnish details. In the aggregate twenty officers are occupied on the work in Ireland for seven weeks, which represents the services of three officers throughout the year. In addition a partial audit is given at longer intervals to the following accounts:—Navy. Haulbowline Dockyard. Army. Store Accounts. Prisons. Dundrum Asylum. Customs. Inland Revenue. Telegraphs.

Saturday Half-Holiday in Irish Government Offices.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that in a number of public departments (including the Post Office, Inland Revenue Office, Custom House, Admiralty, India Office, and Board of Education) a half-holiday is granted each Saturday to the members of the clerical staffs, and that in a few public departments this privilege is limited to alternate Saturdays; and will he say whether it is within the discretion of the heads of these latter departments to grant a weekly Saturday half-holiday, provided that the state of public business permits.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The hon. Member will find that my predecessor answered a similar Question by the hon. Member for Mid Cork on the 16th May last. I have nothing to add to that reply.

Promotion of Assistant Clerks.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, under the system of promoting assistant clerks to Second Division clerkships, as at present administered, it is possible for an assistant clerk who is eligible for this promotion in respect of service, and qualified in the opinion of the head of his department for the higher appointment, to be kept in the assistant clerks' class for an indefinite period, whereas meanwhile assistant clerks in other offices, which are better staffed or in which vacancies occur more frequently, will receive promotion; and whether he will consider some scheme by which combined service and merit will ensure promotion as allowed by the Order in Council, and by which meritorious assistant clerks may not be debarred from promotion by the non-occurrence of casual vacancies in departments to which they are assigned.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Civil servants must naturally look for promotion principally in the departments to which they are assigned, and the chances of promotion necessarily vary in the several departments. Before the Treasury could entertain a proposal to promote an assistant clerk in one department, on the ground of special merit, to the Second Division, with a view to his assignment to another department, it would be necessary that the heads of the two departments should concur in an application to the Treasury to this end; and until such a case arises I do not think that the Treasury can usefully consider the question.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury with reference to the fact that sixty-six new class assistant clerks have been promoted to the Second Division, if he will state the offices in which these promotions have been made, and the respective numbers of such promotions in each office.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I learn from the Civil Service Commissioners that the total number of promotions of assistant clerks (abstractors) of the new class to the Second Division up to the 11th March, 1906, has been as follows :—

Department.	Number of Promotions.
Admiralty	5
Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of	2
Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, Department of	3
Home Office	2
Inland Revenue	20
Irish Land Commission	1
Local Government Board (England)	2
Local Government Board (Ireland)	2
Post Office	21
Public Works Loan Board	1
Scotch Education Department	1
Stationery Office	1
War Office	5
Total	66

Irish Tax Revenue.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what proportion of the total tax revenue collected in Ireland during the years 1890, 1895, 1900, and 1905 respectively was contributed by each province.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The materials for a reply to this Question are not available.

Position of Thornley Sub-Postman and Sunderland-Boldon Rural Postman.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is yet in a position to report the result of his investigations as to the sub-office postman stationed at Thornley and the rural postman working between Sunderland and Boldon.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) (1) The duty of the postman at Thornley involves an attendance from 6.40 a.m. to 2 p.m., with intervals off duty amounting to two and a quarter hours, and another attendance from 7 p.m. to 8.45 p.m. His total actual attendance is, therefore, only six hours fifty minutes. Although the duty is not excessive, I find the man's attendance can, without detriment to the service, be slightly reduced by extending one of his intervals off duty in the middle of the day, and I have given instructions accordingly. His attendance will thus be reduced to six hours twenty-five minutes. The postman, to suit his own convenience, is permitted to return to his home between 2 p.m. and 7 p.m., and to use his official cycle for the purpose, the journey occupying about half an hour in each direction. The man employed on the duty was temporarily appointed, at his own request, in February last at wages of 16s. a week. His appointment has now been made permanent, and he will receive wages commencing at 17s. a week. The additional allowance of 1s. a week, referred to by the hon. Member, was for cleaning the bicycle. It will be continued. (2) The official attendance of the Sunderland to Cleadon (near Boldon) rural postman is from 6 a.m. to 10.15 a.m., from 2 p.m. to 3.45 p.m., and from 4.30 p.m. to 5.45 p.m., a total of seven and a quarter hours, of which about six hours ten minutes are occupied in actual travelling on a journey of twenty-three and a quarter miles, twelve driven and eleven and a quarter performed on foot. The postman has intervals off duty at Cleadon amounting to four and a half hours. I have given instructions for shelter to be provided for him at the expense of the Department. A revision of this post is under consideration with a view to the use of a cycle instead of a horse and cart. The change, if adopted, may involve the transfer of the present postman to another duty. The allowance made to the postman for horsekeep is intended to cover the cost of stabling at Cleadon as well as at Sunderland; but, if it is decided to maintain the mounted post, I will consider whether the allowance is adequate.

Duty in Australia on Trade Catalogues.

MR. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that duty is levied in Australia on trade catalogues posted separately in large quantities to that country from the United Kingdom, while no duty is levied in the United States on similar trade catalogues, he will consider the advisability of placing the matter before the Colonial Conference with the view of the discontinuance of the practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I understand that this question will be discussed with the Prime Minister of Australia.

Currency of British Postal Orders in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.

MR. L. HASLAM: To ask the Postmaster-General, in consideration of the fact that British postal orders are payable in many parts of the British Empire, while in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada such is not the case, whether he will consider the advisability of placing the matter before the Colonial Conference for consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) British postal orders are payable in New Zealand, and Australia and Canada are now the only important parts of the British Empire which have not accepted the Imperial Postal Order scheme. I am in communication with the Postmasters-General of the Dominion and the Commonwealth, with a view to overcoming, if possible, the difficulties which have hitherto prevented the acceptance of the scheme in those parts of the Empire; but it is feared that there will be no time for the discussion of the question at the Colonial Conference.

Applications for Loans by Local Authorities.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what was the number of applications by local authorities for loans for public works pending on 31st March, 1907; what were the amounts involved; and what were the dates on which the applications were originally made, and by what authorities, and for what purpose were they made.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The particulars asked for are not immediately available, and could only be obtained after an examination of several hundred files of paper, which would involve much time and labour.

Depression in the Building Trade—Municipal Works Pending.

MR. BRODIE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the depressed state of the building trade, and the probability of its not being in a normal condition, although it is improving, by next winter, he will have a schedule drawn up stating all municipal works which are at present under consideration, and endeavour to arrange for some scheme by which a proportion may be started in the various districts of the country at regular intervals.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I appreciate the object which my hon. friend has in view, but I am afraid that it would not be practicable to arrange a scheme of the kind suggested in the Question. The time for starting particular works must, I think, be left entirely to the local authorities by whom they are undertaken. I believe, however, that there is a growing tendency on the part of the larger local authorities to afford as much continuous employment as possible; and, consistently with the economic and efficient carrying out of works, the Local Government Board would desire to encourage this.

Use of Land Purchased under Loan by Municipal Authorities.

MR. BRODIE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that it is the custom of the Local Government Board to forbid local authorities using land obtained by means of a public loan for any purpose other than that particular purpose for which it was originally bought, even when there is no covenant between the local authority and the seller of the land preventing its use by the authority for any purpose they desire; whether he is able, by administrative action, to free the hands of municipalities in this respect; whether he will take measures to do so; and whether, in the event of its not being possible to attain this object by administrative action, he will introduce legislation for the purpose at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The difficulty in this matter arises out of certain decisions of the High Court to the effect that, in the absence of statutory provisions to the contrary, land acquired by a local authority cannot be used for any purpose other than that for which it was acquired. The difficulty cannot be removed by administrative action; but I should be glad to take advantage of any suitable opportunity of dealing with the matter by legislation.

Boarded-out Poor Law Children.

SIR GEORGE SCOTT ROBERTSON (Bradford, Central): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of Poor Law children at present maintained in the district and separate schools and in the village communities of London and of the provinces respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The number of children in separate establishments of the guardians of Poor Law unions in England and Wales on the 1st January last was as follows:—

	London.	Outside London.	Total.
In district and separate schools - -	7,194	4,615	11,809
In cottage, scattered, and other homes	4,584	11,305	15,889

Navy—Casualties to Ships.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to the official statement furnished to the House of forty-one groundings of His Majesty's ships in 1905, whether these groundings include vessels not in the Navy List, seeing that they are not all mentioned in the Return, No. 319, of casualties to ships on the Navy List during 1905; and whether he is aware that Return No. 319 has already been shown to have omitted cases of vessels in collision.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The statement of groundings included only vessels shown in the Navy List. Cases in which a ship touches ground where no damage is done and no blame is attributable are not regarded as "casualties" for the purposes of the Return mentioned. My attention has already been called to several accidental omissions of an unimportant nature.

Police in Scotland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state the total number of police in Scotland and the proportion per thousand of the population.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The total number of the authorised police force, excluding the Orkney and Shetland Islands and excluding additional police privately employed and paid, is 5,442. This affords approximately one policeman to 857 of the estimated population.

Payments to Seamen under Allotment Notes.

MR. L. HASLAM: To ask the President of the Board of Trade will he consider the advisability of issuing instructions that when a seaman has agreed to allot, by means of an allotment note, a portion of his wages in favour of a near relative or of a savings bank, and when the seaman has completed his voyage and the remaining portion of his wages is due, that an allotment shall be made in proportion to the amount of wages due for each completed week when less than a month's wages are due.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Payments under allotment notes to seamen are regulated by the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts,† and especially by the Act of last session,‡ and the Board of Trade have no power to issue instructions to the effect suggested by my honourable friend.

---

† Section 141 of Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.

‡ Section 61 and Section 62, Merchant Shipping Act.

Cost of New Asylum at Napsbury.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will state the cost per bed of the new asylum for Middlesex at Napsbury.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I am in communication with the visiting committee with a view to obtaining complete and accurate information as to the cost of the Napsbury Asylum per bed; and when I have done so I shall be pleased to forward it to the hon. Member.

Disposal of Site of Duke of York's School.

Major COATES (Lewisham): To ask the First Commissioner of Works when the Committee now considering the disposal of the site of the Duke of York's School at Chelsea was appointed, and of whom the Committee consists.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The Committee, which was appointed in June, 1906, consists of:—Chairman, the Right Honourable R. K. Causton, M.P., Paymaster-General; Mr. F. D. Acland, M.P.; Major-General H. D. Hutchinson, C.S.I., Director of Staff Duties; the Honourable Sir Schomberg McDonnell, K.C.B., C.V.O., Secretary, Office of Works; Sir G. D. A. Fleetwood Wilson, K.C.B., Director of Army Finance; Secretary, Mr. B. M. Draper.

Deduction from Probate Duty and Agricultural Grants in Ireland.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the amounts to be deducted this year from the Probate Duty and agricultural grants due to each county in Ireland, and the total to be deducted from the whole of Ireland, owing to embarrassment arising from improvident prices under the Land Act of 1903; if he is aware that the amount of these deductions must now be paid in rates locally; and, if the annuities are being punctually paid, will he explain how the deductions become necessary.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The following statement shows the sums deducted in respect of land purchase from grants payable to county councils in the month of March, 1907, as determined by certificates furnished by the Irish Land Commission and the Commissioners of National Debt:—

Counties.	Deduction from Death Duty Grant.			Deduction from Agricultural Grant.			Total.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Antrim - - - - -	950	6	1	—			950	6	1
Armagh - - - - -	1,356	12	0	—			1,356	12	0
Carlow - - - - -	1,518	6	11	—			1,518	6	11
Cavan - - - - -	421	11	9	—			421	11	9
Clare - - - - -	870	11	8	—			870	11	8
Cork - - - - -	5,031	17	9	—			5,031	17	9
Donegal - - - - -	738	12	8	—			738	12	8
Down - - - - -	2,230	12	2	—			2,230	12	2
Dublin - - - - -	1,574	11	7	—			1,574	11	7
Fermanagh - - - -	1,425	18	6	—			1,425	18	6
Galway - - - - -	3,622	13	6	—			3,622	13	6
Kerry - - - - -	838	8	3	—			838	8	3
Kildare - - - - -	2,957	8	3	5,507	4	6	8,464	12	9
Kilkenny - - - - -	4,693	0	5	392	5	8	5,085	6	1
King's County - - -	1,582	0	8	—			1,582	0	8
Leitrim - - - - -	552	9	6	—			552	9	6
Limerick - - - - -	4,384	13	4	—			4,384	13	4
Londonderry - - - -	1,378	9	4	—			1,378	9	4

Counties.	Deduction from Death Duty Grant.			Deduction from Agricultural Grant.			Total.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Longford - - - - - -	1,428	14	11	36	7	1	1,465	2	0
Louth - - - - - -	398	1	1	—			398	1	1
Mayo - - - - - -	1,292	16	1	—			1,292	16	1
Meath - - - - - -	3,929	15	5	—			3,929	15	5
Monaghan - - - - -	530	18	1	—			530	18	1
Queen's County - - - -	1,535	11	3	—			1,535	11	3
Roscommon - - - - -	3,421	13	8	1,384	4	2	4,805	17	10
Sligo - - - - - -	1,506	19	7	—			1,506	19	7
Tipperary, North Riding - -	1,198	2	0	—			1,198	2	0
Tipperary, South Riding - -	2,961	9	1	—			2,961	9	1
Tyrone - - - - - -	2,279	4	11	—			2,279	4	11
Waterford - - - - -	1,002	16	7	—			1,002	16	7
Westmeath - - - - -	2,393	9	0	—			2,393	9	0
Wexford - - - - - -	2,773	5	5	—			2,773	5	5
Wicklow - - - - - -	2,896	10	11	220	18	8	3,117	9	7
Total - - - - -	65,677	12	4	7,541	0	1	73,218	12	5

As to the remainder of the Question I beg to refer to my Answer of yesterday to the Question of the hon. Member for North Kildare.†

Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the proportion per thousand of the population.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The total number of the Royal Irish Constabulary, including officers, on 31st March, 1907, was 9,946. The proportion per thousand of the population of Ireland, exclusive of the Dublin metropolitan district, according to the Census of 1901, is 2·44.

Irish Elementary Education—Tests for Teachers.

MR. PIKE PEASE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if, in revising the system of elementary education in Ireland, he proposes to abolish tests for teachers and to establish public control.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) No proposals for the revision of the system of elementary education in Ireland are at present before the House.

Lavatory Accommodation at Kingston Barracks.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that in the barracks at Kingston-on-Thames, eleven miles from Hyde Park Corner and twelve miles from the War Office, the barrack rooms are still unprovided with lavatory conveniences, and the men are forced to use urinal tubs which have to be removed by hand; and whether he will take steps to remedy this state of affairs.

MR. HICKS BEACH: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that at the barracks at Kingston-upon-Thames, in order to reduce the expense of water, the water-closets used by the men are only allowed to be flushed twice a day; and whether, with a view to preventing the discouragement of recruiting and in the interests of health, he proposes to make any alterations in the existing system.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The drainage at Kingston Barracks is at present under reconstruction, and, as part of that reconstruction, the whole of the latrines, urinals, etc., used by the troops will in future be in accordance with modern sanitation. Urine tubs for night use are retained as a temporary measure. The existing water-closets are flushed twice daily without any stint of water, but when the new system is in order will be flushed as used.

---

† See Col. 619.

Lodging Accommodation at Tidworth for Officers' Wives.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, while provision is made at Home and Foreign stations for the wives of non-commissioned officers and men, no accommodation is provided for the wives of officers; whether, for example, at Salisbury Plain there is no accommodation for the wife of an officer within ten miles of the camp; and whether, with a view to the comfort of married officers and to retaining them in the Service, he will consider the advisability of building a proportion of small houses or bungalows which might be let to married officers at a reasonable rent.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is recognised that at Tidworth some of the officers who are entitled under the Regulations to lodging money have a difficulty in finding suitable accommodation in close proximity to the barracks, and a scheme is now being considered with a view to overcome this difficulty.

Government's Licensing Proposals.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Prime Minister whether he is yet in a position to state when the licensing legislation referred to in His Majesty's Speech will be introduced; and if the contemplated Bill will deal with the licensing question in Ireland as well as in England, or if any separate measure of licensing reform to meet the needs of Ireland will be introduced by the Government during the present session.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I am not in a position as yet to answer the first part of the hon. Member's Question. Ireland will not be included in the Bill in question, nor is it intended to introduce a separate measure dealing with Irish licences during the present session

Spurious Sports Bill.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock): To ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that on 5th April last a deer turned out of a cart to be hunted by the Berks and Bucks Staghounds fell exhausted after a long run, and was so severely bitten by the hounds that it had to be destroyed; that on 7th April a deer being hunted by the same pack, on attempting to leap a spiked iron fence at Reading, was impaled upon the spikes, and having hung in this position for about half-an-hour was lifted down in a disembowelled condition and then destroyed; and whether, in view of these incidents and of public opinion, he will give facilities for the passing of the Spurious Sports Bill.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I have no information as to the painful incidents mentioned by my hon. friend, and I cannot at present add anything to the Answer which I gave to a Question of my hon. friend the Member for Peterborough on 14th March.†

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Obsolete War Ships.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what it cost to build the first-class battleship "Sans Pareil," the third-class battleship "Conqueror," and the third-class armoured cruiser "Undaunted;" whether the above-named vessels only realised the sum of £57,500 by public auction at Chatham Dockyard on 9th April; and whether he can inform the House as to the weight of iron, steel, brass, and copper of the three vessels, and also the price which would have been obtainable in the market for such as old scrap.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The total cost of the three vessels named was £1,454,093, excluding guns. The amount realised at the sale on the 9th April was £57,800. The weights of the iron, steel, brass and copper cannot be given with any degree of accuracy, and the scrap value depends entirely upon the state of the metal market at the time of sale.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 252–3.

MR. JENKINS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the whole of the component parts of the ship are weighed when the ship is under construction?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That may be so.

MR. JENKINS: Is it not a fact that the total weight of the ship can be easily obtained from the Dockyard record after completion?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am informed that the total weight cannot be given with approximation to accuracy.

Progress of Ship Construction.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the anticipated dates of completion of the three armoured vessels of the "Defence" class laid down in February, 1905; and whether the "Defence," laid down 22nd February, 1905, is yet launched.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The date for completion of "Minotaur" and "Shannon" is 31st March, 1908. The launch of the "Defence" is fixed for 27th April, 1907, and the date for completion is December, 1908.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Can the right hon. Gentleman point to any similar delay in the case of Germany?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I must ask for notice of that Question.

MR. BELLAIRS asked if an earlier date was not fixed in the Cawdor Memorandum for the completion of the ships?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That can be aswered by reference to the Memorandum itself.

Naval Strength.

*MR. NUTTALL (Lancashire, Stretford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the completion of the large and powerful fleet of nine battleships and the ten armoured cruisers in 1909, at an estimated cost of £29,000,000, will not place the Navy far beyond the three-Power standard which we already possess; and whether, in view of the fact that neither France nor Germany had laid down a single ship of the "Dreadnought" type in 1906, the Government will consider the desirability of deferring the commencement of the three additional ships of that type and other ships proposed in this year's programme until next year.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It would be premature to make any statement in regard to the shipbuilding programme until the discussion on Vote 8.

Cavalry and Guards Probationers.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what proportion of the probationers in the cavalry and Guards who lately went up for their examination passed; and whether probationers are likely to continue.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): No cavalry probationers have yet been examined; the first examination will be in December next. Twenty-one Guards (including household cavalry) probationers were examined in December, 1906, and fourteen passed. The probationary scheme is only a temporary measure and will be discontinued as soon as the exigencies of the service permit.

CAPTAIN FABER: Would it not be a good thing if the colonel commanding were given the right to say whether probationers should have a Commission?

MR. HALDANE: I think the present system much better.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Then why change it?

MR. HALDANE was understood to reply that he only proposed to change the probationary system.

Army Economies.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the expected economies in the cost of the Army are produced solely by the reduction of personnel; and, if not, whether they are produced in part by reduction of war stores and ammunition.

Mr. HALDANE: Reductions of men admit of reduction in practice ammunition and some kinds of stores. The completion of the re-armament of the Horse and Field Artillery produces a material saving in 1907–8 as compared with 1906-7; and there are other cases in which the completion of requirements leads to reduced expenditure. The hon. Member may rest assured that the economies to which he refers are not being effected by reducing anything which is necessary for the fighting efficiency of the Army.

War Stores and Ammunition.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the quantity of war stores and ammunition now in stock and immediately available is greater or less than the quantity stated by the Mowatt Committee to be the minimum consistent with national safety.

Mr. HALDANE: The reserves of war stores and ammunition in stock and available are in accordance with the recommendations of the Mowatt Committee.

Woolwich Arsenal.

Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there are a number of workmen at present only partially employed at Woolwich, and therefore only earning but part of the amount of wages which they had been accustomed to earn when fully employed; and, if so, will he make provision so that they may leave the service without forfeiture of the bonus to which they would be entitled if discharged.

Mr. HALDANE: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the last part of the Question, men who are employed in shops where reductions will be necessary may apply to be discharged, and if, consistently with the public interest, such application can be granted, will be allowed to go and to receive such bonus as their service entitles them to.

Comilla Riots.

Mr. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the recent disturbances at Comilla, where a number of Mahomedans entered the bazaar crying that the Nawab of Dacca had ordered them to beat the Hindus and raze the shop of one Gogiram Pal to the ground, and, further, that in general Hindu shops were entered, the occupants assaulted, goods trampled on, and common robbery committed; and whether steps will be taken to institute a public inquiry with a view to recompense being made by the Nawab to the assaulted and robbed.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Hindus at Comilla have lodged complaints at the inaction of the police in the recent riots, in not preventing the looting of shops; and whether, seeing that rioting or disturbance between Mahomedans and Hindus was of rare occurrence prior to the partition of Bengal, steps will be taken to prevent incitement to disorder by the Nawab of Dacca and those responsible for pro-partition demonstrations.

I beg further to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that serious charges have been made against the district magistrate and the district superintendent of police at Comilla, in that the former justified the recent disturbances as the result of seditious speeches made by speakers from Calcutta, and the latter, in that when informed whilst at his club that a golmal was in progress at the bazaar, did not consider the matter worth his special attention on the spot; and whether, seeing that subsequently the Commissioner telegraphed for reinforcements and 125 military police, and the assistant inspector-general left Dacca and Silchar to quell the disturbance, and in view of the fact that Hindus were beaten, goods destroyed, and robbery committed, he will give instructions for a public inquiry into the whole matter.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. John Morley, Montrose Burghs): Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer his three Questions on this subject together. The local Government have submitted a detailed report on the disturbances at Comilla, and have called for further reports and explanations on some points, pending the receipt of which a final expression of opinion must be reserved. Meanwhile precautions have been taken against a recurrence of the disorders, and all complaints made by individuals are under investigation or settlement in the courts of law. I do not think any action on my part is necessary at present.

MR. O'GRADY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of the men has already suffered imprisonment?

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Yes, Sir.

Punjab Land Alienation Bill.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the all-Punjab demonstration held at Lahore to protest against the Punjab Land Alienation Bill, now passed into law; whether, as a principal result of the Act, the powers of the collector as chief executive and revenue officer of the district have been largely extended, placing the summary jurisdiction of such officer above the reach of the civil court; whether he is aware that religious and charitable gifts and alienations come under the veto of such officer, who alone can determine the *bona fides* of such gifts; and whether, having regard to the effect the Act will have upon that class known as the zemindars, reducing their *status* to that of moneylender or usurer, steps will be taken to bring the matter before the attention of the Punjab Legislative Council with a view to mitigating grievances arising from the Act.

MR. MORLEY: There appears to be some misconception in the matter. The Punjab Land Alienation Act, which placed restrictions on the alienation of land from the agricultural to the non-agricultural classes, and empowered the district revenue officers to veto transfers made in contravention of the law, has been in operation since 1900. It is reported to have worked satisfactorily, and to be popular with the agricultural classes. The Bill to which the hon. Member presumably refers is confined to amending the Act in certain particulars, and does not affect its main principles, though it will deprive the so-called "statutory agriculturist" of the power to purchase land from the agricultural classes. The "statutory agriculturist" is, I understand, an artificial creation of the law, and may be, and often is, a person who does not belong to the agricultural classes. When the proceedings of the Legislative Council come before me, I will carefully consider the memorials which have reached me objecting to its provisions.

British East Africa Police.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the total number of the police force enrolled in the British East Africa Protectorate, excluding the additional force of twenty white men ordered to be raised on the 18th March; and what are the numbers respectively of white members, excluding the above-mentioned additional men, and native members of the force.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): According to the latest returns the police force of the East Africa Protectorate consists of thirty-five white officers, and about 2,000 native officers and men.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what are the regulations for the enrolment of natives in the police force of the British East Africa Protectorate; whether untrained and uneducated natives are now serving; whether such natives are the custodians of the public peace, with power to arrest white men and women; whether the Secretary of State is aware that the existing condition of the police force, in regard to the selection of the native members of that force, gives rise to apprehension and dissatisfaction amongst the white population; and whether he will take steps to secure that further and better regulations shall be enforced in that respect, in order to secure due protection of white men and white women in the territory.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Regulations to which the hon. Member refers will be found in the Police Ordinance of the Protectorate, a copy of which is in the Library of the House. The rank and file of the force consists partly of Indians and Swahilis who are employed in the more settled parts, and partly of natives who are chiefly employed at the outlying stations. No doubt they are mostly uneducated, and, when they first join the force, untrained. The powers of the police to arrest persons are in general the same as those entrusted to the police of British India under Sections 54–67 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Complaints as to the constitution of the police force have been received, but they have been of a general character and have not alleged specific misconduct. The Secretary of State considers that the establishment of a small white police force, which had been decided upon before the recent incident at Nairobi, will remove all reasonable grounds for complaint.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Have the Administration in East Africa any power to deport persons found guilty of such conduct as may endanger the peace of the country?

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot say precisely what powers of deportation are possessed by the Government of British East Africa.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: Have any steps been taken to investigate the complaints already received?

MR. CHURCHILL: I am not aware whether any special steps have been taken. We are always receiving very full Reports, and during the last three months we have had the advantage of the presence in this country of the Commissioner of that district and have had the opportunity of discussing many matters with him at the Colonial Office.

Population of East Africa Protectorate.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the present total population of the East Africa Protectorate, and of this population how many are white and how many are black or coloured; how many soldiers there are in the Protectorate; and how many of these are white men.

MR. CHURCHILL: The native population of the East Africa Protectorate is roughly estimated at four millions; the white population according to the latest return numbered 1,813, including 264 Government officials. There are no white troops in the Protectorate except the Volunteer Reserve numbering 160. The number of native troops serving there, *i.e.*, the 3rd and part of the 1st Battalion of the King's African Rifles, is about 1,200 with thirty white officers.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: In view of the figures given in the Answer, will steps be taken to increase the white force? Will the hon. Gentleman consider the possibility of getting a larger grant for the purpose?

MR. CHURCHILL: We are doing everything possible to reduce the expenditure.

Macedonian Budget.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Estimates for the financial year, March, 1907, to March, 1908, have yet been framed and submitted to the Financial Commission in Macedonia; if not, when are they expected; whether he can state the amount of the contemplated deficit, as well as the amounts entered for civil and military expenditure respectively; and whether it is proposed to include the expenditure in connection with the reorganisation and strengthening of the Third Army Corps in the amount to be charged to the Macedonian Budget in respect of military expenditure.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (SIR EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The Estimates for the Macedonian Budget for the current financial year have been submitted to the Sublime Porte by the Financial Commission. The estimated deficit is £789,290. The estimated expenditure for civil administration is £839,801, and for military expenditure £1,352,894. His Majesty's Government are not aware of the particular items of which the latter portion of the Budget is composed. The total increase in it is £8,203.

Deaths by Violence in Macedonia.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the number of deaths due to violence which occurred in the three vilayets of Macedonia for the period from the 1st October, 1906, to the end of March, 1907.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The particulars of violent deaths in Macedonia for the month of March have not yet been received. The total number of deaths from the 1st October till the end of February is 338. The majority of the cases were due to the operations of bands of rival nationalities, but the deaths in encounters between troops and bands are also included.

Khartoum Lands and Schools.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in the case of an official appropriation of land at Khartoum, the Governor, Stanton Bey, has informed the natives concerned that the price paid to them is simple backsheesh, given at the pleasure of the Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the subject. If the hon. Member will supply me with particulars of what appropriation of land is referred to, I will inquire what the circumstances and conditions of the appropriation were.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the natives at Khartoum have requested the Government to establish schools for girls, and have been referred to the Protestant schools controlled by missionary organisations, where the children are taught solely on Christian lines.

I beg further to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Soudan Government has appropriated for public purposes 1,800 feddans of land north of Khartoum, at the confluence of the Blue and White Niles, and has paid for it, not at the market rate, but at prices fixed by the officials at their pleasure; and whether at Khartoum North (Halfayah) the Government has forcibly appropriated land from native owners at £2 per feddan and has sold it for prices of £15 or more per feddan to the Model Farming Association.

I also wish to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, since the conquest of the Soudan, the administration has confiscated the lands and property formerly, and in large part before the time of the Mahdi, owned by the Wakf—, that is to say, the Moslem ecclesiastical organisation which received bequests and gifts from Moslems for religious or charitable purposes; and, if so, whether the property thus confiscated could not be devoted to purposes of education.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to these Questions is that I have no information, but will make inquiry. With regard to female education, I have to refer the hon. Member to Chapter 42 of Lord Cromer's Report for 1906.

Siamese Cessions to France.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the King of Siam has recently ceded to France the three fertile and populous provinces of Battongbang, Siem-Reap, and Sisophon; and, if so, what compensation Siam obtained, and if he can state what effect, if any, the transaction will have on British interests in the Far East.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must ask the hon. Member to wait till the terms of the treaty are made public before I can answer questions about it.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is it a fact there has been a treaty?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, there has been a treaty between France and Siam, but I must wait for the parties concerned to make it public before I can say anything on it.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: But how about our interests in Siam?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I may refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Agreement of 1904, between the late Government and France, which clearly defined the interests of the two countries in Siam.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman satisfied with this new treaty?

[No Answer was returned].

Hamburg Strike.

MR. JAMES PARKER (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs whether, since the 4th April, any further destitute British subjects have applied to the British Consul at Hamburg for assistance; whether they have been told, as was the case about three weeks ago, to go to the harbour at Hamburg where there was plenty of work; and whether the Foreign Office is prepared to give instructions to British Consuls to cease recommending destitute British workmen to act the part of blacklegs in foreign ports.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I am not aware that since April 4th any further destitute British subjects have applied to the British Consulate General at Hamburg for assistance. His Majesty's Consular officers are only authorised to repatriate destitute British subjects at the public expense when no other means of relieving their destitution can be discovered. I may add that His Majesty's Consul General at Hamburg has been most careful not to interfere in any way in the present labour dispute in that city.

Honduras Police.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanark, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, under the new Alien Law of the Republic of Honduras, British subjects who may be regarded by the laws of Honduras as domiciled there are liable to be called on to serve as armed police in the event of the invasion of Honduras by any hostile force; and whether His Majesty's Government have assented to this proposition.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Article 44 of the new Alien Law exempts foreigners from military service, but states that domiciled foreigners are obliged to serve as armed police, for the security of their property and the maintenance of order in the town where they are residing. The full text of the Law will be found in Parliamentary Paper, Miscellaneous, No. 1 of 1907. This is merely a measure for the preservation of domestic law and order, and in view of the exemption of foreigners from military service could not be applied to resist invasion by a hostile force.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): May I ask if British subjects can only be employed in this way in the case of special trouble or riot?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have given the actual words. There can be no doubt as to their meaning.

Persia—The Tufangchari Tax.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the imposition in the Yezd district of the tax known as tufangchari is in accordance with the Anglo-Persian Convention of 9th February, 1903; and, if, not, whether any efforts, and what efforts, are being made to put a stop to its imposition.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have no information as to the imposition of the special tax in question. But the levy of illegal taxes in the Yezd district in general has been the subject of representations to the Persian Government on the part of His Majesty's Legation at Tehran.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to ascertain if this tax is being imposed, and, if it is, make representations on the subject?

Sir EDWARD GREY: Representations have already been made in March last.

Opium Production in China.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken by the Government of China to reduce the area of land now cultivated in China for the production of opium.

Sir EDWARD GREY: By Article 1 of the Regulations issued under the Imperial Decree of September 20th, 1906, no new ground can be placed under poppy cultivation, and that already under poppy cultivation must be reduced by one-tenth at least every year. If the regulation is evaded, the ground can be confiscated. A fresh decree was issued on 7th February last, with the object of securing greater uniformity in carrying out the existing regulations, and it is understood that it will be followed by further regulations prescribing the conditions under which the gradual diminution of cultivation is to be effected. I cannot yet say how far these decrees have been made effective.

MR. LYNCH: Have the Government at their dispoaal any machinery for ascertaining what the Chinese Government are really doing?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, Sir; there are consular reports on the subject.

MR. LYNCH: I am informed that no opportunity is afforded of getting information.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Have the Indian Government made any corresponding regulations for the reduction of the growth of opium?

[No Answer was returned.]

Government Paint Factories.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the factory and workshop regulations made by him on the 21st January last in respect of dangerous and unhealthy industries, which do not apply to factories and workshops in which paints and colours are manufactured, not for sale, but solely for use in the business of the occupier, apply to the Royal Dockyards; and, if not, whether he will explain why this is so, and arrange that all Government workshops shall be included, and the workmen so employed receive the benefit of these regulations which materially affect their lives and health.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The regulations do not apply to the Royal Dockyards. Places in which the manufacture of paints is carried on only as ancillary to the main business of the factory were not included in the rules because the same danger to the workers is not found to exist in those places as in places where the manufacture is carried on for sale as the business of the factory. Nearly all the cases of plumbism reported from dockyards occur to men engaged in using the mixed paints, or in scraping off old paint in confined spaces such as the double bottom of ships, and to these processes the paint and colour regulations do not apply. Any danger, however, that may be caused to the workers employed in the dockyards in the making of paints by the inhalation of poisonous dust can be dealt with adequately by ordinary administrative action under Section 74 of the Factory Act, and such action will be taken wherever necessary.

Alcester Vaccination Case.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that on the 19th day of March, 1907, A. H. Moore, of Alcester, Shaftesbury, applied for a vaccination exemption certificate at the Shaftesbury petty sessions, two magistrates only sitting, Mr. H. A. Dunstan, chairman, and Mr. L. Fox Pitt, and that Mr. Dunstan refused to sign the exemption certificate; and if he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have communicated with the justices who adjudicated in this case. They inform me that the case was carefully considered, and that the applicant did not satisfy both of them that he had a conscientious belief that vaccination would be prejudicial to the child in question. As I have often stated before, I have no authority to interfere with the discretion of the magistrates in this matter.

MR. LUPTON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the new Vaccination Bill will be brought in?

MR. GLADSTONE: That Question should be addressed to the President of the Local Government Board.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Is it necessary in the case of ordinary justices that two shall adjudicate where a stipendiary magistate sits alone?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, that is so.

Slate Quarry Fatalities.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that, according to the Report on Mines and Quarries for 1905, the fatalities among the inside workers in mines were 1·519 per 1000, whilst among inside workers in slate quarries it was no less than 2·39; and what steps, if any, have been taken in face of the statement on Mines and Quarries (1905), page 95, that an unsatisfactory feature of Table 82 is the high death rate among the inside workers in slate quarries.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am aware of the figures to which the hon. Member calls my attention and which are those published in the annual statistics issued by my Department. The figures however for 1906, not yet issued, will show a very great decrease in the death rate for the Carnarvonshire slate quarries, only one fatal accident having occurred at those quarries during the year. The conditions existing at these quarries are receiving special attention from the inspectors, and I have called for a further Report from them on the subject.

Mr. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): In view of the great danger in the working of metalliferous mines, will evidence as to them be received before the Mines Commission?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I think it will be open to the Commission to take such evidence, but I am not sure.

Crime in York.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the fact that during the year 1905 there were 295 indictable crimes known to the police to have been committed in the county borough of York, and whether, in connection with these crimes, only 171 persons were apprehended; whether he can state if this class of crime is diminishing in this district; whether he can state the cause of the failure of the police to secure these offenders; and whether he intends to take any steps to enable the police to bring to trial a larger percentage of the offenders.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The figures are correctly quoted, but the great majority of the so-called "crimes" are small larcenies disposed of summarily by the justices. There are many cases where the owner of the stolen property declines to prosecute, and many cases where several offences are committed by the same person; so that, if the police force is efficient and the returns are correctly made, the number of persons prosecuted must always be considerably less than the number of offences committed. In York, the proportion is about the same as in England and Wales generally. There is no marked increase or decrease of crime in York.

Agrarian Crime in Yorkshire.

Mr. MOONEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that during the year 1905 there were fifty-three cases of malicious injury to property, including twenty-three cases of arson and four cases of killing and maiming of cattle, known to the police in the county of Yorkshire; if he can state when the figures for the year 1906 will be available, or if he can now state whether there is any diminution of this class of crime in this county.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The figures stated are substantially accurate. The figures for 1906 are not yet available, so I cannot say whether they show any diminution.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): May I ask whether the proportion of crime to population in Yorkshire is not one which the Government would gladly see attained or even approached in the county represented by the hon. Member who put this Question?

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): The proportion is much smaller.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the proportion of crime to population in Ireland is far less than in England?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Yes, I believe that is so. But we are always glad to see a diminution.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): Is it not the fact that the Returns show that in Ireland for many crimes committed people are not brought to justice?

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: And is it not the fact that much of the crime in Ireland is due to the circulation of bad whisky which some people here know about?

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): The fox run to earth!

Death Certificates in the Shardlow Union.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the charge (3s. 7d.) made for death certificates by the relieving officer and collector of the Shardlow Union; and, if so, whether it is his intention to take any action, having for its object the fixing of a smaller charge for such certificates.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): One of the relieving officers of the Shardlow Union is also registrar of births and deaths, and it is in the latter capacity that he has issued certificates of death when required. I understand that in no case has he charged a higher fee than that authorised. The charges in connection with certificates of death are statutory, and I am not empowered to alter them.

Poor Law—Removal of Aged Sick.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that evidence was given at the inquest, held at Poplar on 9th April, on a poor woman named Baker, aged eighty-one, who was ordered by the parish doctor to be removed to the sick asylum, to the effect that this removal was effected by two officers or servants of the guardians of the Stepney union who were both drunk; that the witness's daughter protested against the removal of her mother by men in such a condition; that the men dropped the old woman on the pavement; that when they arrived at the asylum the ambulance was kept twenty minutes before the sick woman could be taken out, as the driver of the ambulance could not find the key; will he say whether the medical officer or the relieving officer is responsible for the safe and proper removal of sick persons for indoor relief; and, if so, whether he will recommend to the Stepney guardians that when aged people in grave sickness are removed from their own homes the guardians should send a doctor or nurse to supervise the removal.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The case to which my hon. friend refers is, I think, that of a woman named Lewis. I have seen the depositions taken at the inquest in that case, which show that the facts are substantially as stated by him. I understand that the guardians have taken some action in this matter, but I am making further investigations with regard to it. As regards the point referred to in the last part of the Question, the clerk to the guardians informs me that in cases of removal to the infirmary or sick asylum, where no female friend or relative can accompany the patient the relieving officer and the medical officer are empowered to engage the services of a female attendant to be present at the removal. In this instance two daughters accompanied the patient.

Lodgers' Letters.

MR. BRAMSDON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will explain why letters addressed to persons who are lodgers cannot be readdressed at the post office; and whether, having regard to the boon that the privilege of readdressing letters at the post office has conferred on householders, he will consider whether he can extend the privilege to all classes.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I have recently given very careful consideration to the point which the hon. Member raises, but I regret that I do not see my way to extending the scope of official redirection. The work of redirection is already a considerable hindrance to the ordinary work of the postmen; and if it were extended to lodgers' letters serious delay and inconvenience would be caused. There is not the same need for official redirection in the case of lodgers as in the case of householders. In any case in which good grounds are shown for requiring the assistance of the post office in the matter, official redirection is, as far as practicable, undertaken.

Trams and Mail Carriage.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state the tramway undertakings in this country with which the Post Office Department have an arrangement as to the carrying of letters or postal employees; and, if so, the payments made in each case for such service.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Payments are made to tramway undertakings for the conveyance of mails or Post Office employees in a large number of cases. It would be impossible to give the detailed information for which the hon. Member asks within the limits of an Answer to a Question.

Hawkhurst Postman's Grievance.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether Rule 116 (iii.), contained in the book of rules for rural postmen and auxiliaries, is still in force; if so, why S. Smith, auxiliary town postman at Hawkhurst, Kent, has been deprived of his fixed Sunday allowance of 3s. 3d. during temporary absence from duty owing to an infectious disease; and, if the said rule has been altered or repealed, why the rural postal officials have not been informed of such alteration or repeal.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The rule is still in force, and Smith's wages were paid in full, but a distinction, which I think unsound, was made between wages and payment for Sunday duty. I have now directed payment to be made in full.

New Zealand Mails.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if any progress has been made in re-arranging the San Francisco mail service to New Zealand; and if he can hold out any prospect of its being shortly re-established.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: So far as I am aware the situation remains unaltered. I am not in a position to express any opinion as to the prospects of the re-establishment of the service, which is entirely outside my control.

Scottish Whaling Stations.

Mr. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland how many whaling stations or factories at present exist in Scotland; and how many of them are owned or occupied by foreigners.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): There are five whaling stations in Scotland. Of these, four are owned by foreigners and one by a British firm.

Constable O'Halloran, Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Constable O'Halloran, who was disabled for life by a gunshot wound received on the night of 9th October last while affording police protection to Colonel Lopdell, near Athenry, was in receipt of pay of £53 a year, and that the pension to which he is entitled now on retiring from the Royal Irish Constabulary is only £24 a year; and seeing, that this constable was on the list for early promotion to the rank of sergeant, whether any, and, if so, what, additional pension will be paid to him by reason of his having been maimed in the discharge of his duty.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): Constable O'Halloran was seriously injured by a gunshot on the occasion mentioned, and has since been under medical treatment. The question whether he is permanently incapacitated for service has not yet been determined. The constable's present pay is £67 per annum. His ordinary pension would amount to £24 a year, but if it should be certified that he is permanently incapacitated by reason of injuries received while on duty, there is power to award him a pension not exceeding his annual pay. Constable O'Halloran has lodged a claim against the county council for compensation in respect of the malicious injury inflicted upon him, and if he should be granted compensation the fact would be taken into account in fixing the amount of pension. The constable's case will receive full consideration.

Loughrea Compensation Appeals at Galway Assizes.

*Captain FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at the late assizes at Galway, Lord Justice Holmes gave compensation for malicious injuries in the district of Loughrea to the amount of £67 19s. 6d. in seven cases; that all these cases were appealed against from quarter sessions by the county council; and that Lord Justice Holmes stated that the taking of these appeals was a scandalous waste of public money; and, if so, will the matter be brought under the notice of the Local Government Board.

MR. BIRRELL: At the recent Galway Assizes the Loughrea District Council appealed, in the exercise of their statutory right, against five awards of compensation for malicious injury. In one case the appeal was successful, and in the remaining four cases the award was confirmed with costs, the total amount of compensation in these cases being £53 and the costs £22. According to a newspaper report of the proceedings which has been brought to my notice, Lord Justice Holmes made a remark to the effect stated in the Question. The payments made by the council in these cases will come before the Local Government Board's auditor in due course.

Intimidation in Roscommon.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at Roscommon quarter sessions in a case where a policeman was processed for the value of a drum which was damaged in a conflict with the police in an attempt to intimidate one B. O'Brien, the holder of a grass farm; is he aware that the judge stated that intimidation had taken place and dismissed the process, but afterwards reversed this decision and gave compensation for the drum; and will he say if there have been further attempts to intimidate graziers in Roscommon since this decision, and have any of the persons attacked surrendered their property.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Before that Question is answered, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this is canvassing or censuring the conduct of a judge. The Question alleges that the judge said that in consequence of intimidation that he would dismiss the process and that he afterwards reversed that decision, and the Question goes on to ask whether in consequence of that action of the judge attempts at intimidation had increased. Is that not canvassing and censuring the conduct of a judge?

*MR. SPEAKER: If the implication were as the hon. Member suggests it would be clearly out of order, but it does not appear to me, with such knowledge of the facts as the Question gives me that that implication must necessarily be made. The suggestion is that the judge changed his mind; I do not suppose that is any imputation upon him.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The Question asks whether since that action of changing his mind the attempts have increased.

*MR. SPEAKER: The words "since that decision," simply refer to a point of time.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman say if, as a matter of fact, this judge is not a Unionist gentleman appointed by the Unionist Government?

*CAPTAIN FABER: The last thing I should wish to do is to canvass the conduct of any judge in the United Kingdom.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that in the case referred to, which was heard on 27th March, the County Court Judge gave a decree against a constable for damaging a drum. The constable, however, has lodged an appeal, and it would therefore be undesirable to enter into the details of the case. An intimidatory demonstration was attempted at Elphin on 31st March, the particulars of which are stated in my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on 10th April.† I am not aware of any other recent similar case in Roscommon. The police authorities have heard that some graziers in the district have announced their intention of surrendering their farms, but have no information that any surrender has actually taken place.

Irish University Bill.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the proposals of His Majesty's Government for dealing with Irish university education are those outlined by Mr. Bryce in his speech of the 25th January last.

MR. BIRRELL: The proposals of His Majesty's Government will proceed upon the lines indicated by Mr. Bryce, subject it may be, as indeed he intimated, to modifications if found necessary.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 288.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state when it is his intention to place before Parliament the proposals of His Majesty's Government with reference to Irish university education.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not yet in a position to name a date.

Drumsna Evicted Tenant.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Owen Scollan, Lismoyle, Drumsna, an evicted tenant on the Albemarle estate in county Leitrim; and if an inspector will investigate same.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received no application from the person named in the Question.

Cattan Evicted Tenant.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners will have Francis McNally, an evicted tenant, reinstated in his farm at Cattan, on the White estate, in county Leitrim, as negotiations are going on at present for the sale of this estate; and, in the event of his not being permitted to sign the purchase agreement, if he will get compensation, so that he might be able to procure a farm elsewhere.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have considered McNally's application, but have not been able to arrange for his reinstatement. The farm from which he was evicted is held by another tenant. McNally's name has been noted as that of a person suitable to work land, and his claim will be considered by the Commissioners in the event of their having land to dispose of in the district.

Corduff and Finnalaughta Evicted Tenants.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners will have Bernard Bohan, Corduff, and Peter Cannon, Finnalaughta, evicted tenants on the estate of the late Colonel Forbes, in county Leitrim, restored to their former holdings, and, as negotiations are going on for the sale of this estate, if the Estates Commissioners will see that these evicted tenants get the privilege of signing the purchase agreements, and not the men who are in possession of the farms at present.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Bernard Bohan, but not from Peter Cannon. Bohan is in occupation of a holding of sixteen acres, being part of the holding from which his father was evicted. The remainder of the evicted holding is in the occupation of another tenant who is not prepared to surrender it. In the circumstances the Commissioners have decided to take no action in the matter.

Rates for Irish Education.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the total sum raised by local rates during 1906–7 for the purpose of elementary education in Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: No local education rate is raised in Ireland. The expenses of school attendance committees, however, fall upon the rates; and the cost of repairing national schools not vested in the Commissioners of National Education is borne by the localities, as well as a portion of the cost of building such schools.

Catholics and Irish Government Appointment.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that, soon after the appointment of Mr. Henry Williams as Secretary to the Board of Works, Dublin, a letter was received from the Civil Service Commissioners and opened in the Registry to the effect that the Civil Service Commissioners made no inquiry into the religion of clerks appointed after open competition to Government Departments, and considering that this was not a circular letter, and must have been a reply to a special request made by the Board of

Works to have no Roman Catholics appointed to the office, will he cause inquiry to be made from the Board of Works who was responsible for approaching the Civil Service Commissioners on this matter; and, in view of the general belief in the department that it was the Secretary who was guilty of this action, unprecedented in the history of the Civil Service, will he have all the papers in connection with this matter laid before the House of Commons at an early date.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): If the hon. Member will supply me with the evidence on which he has decided to make a charge of this character, I will have it carefully investigated.

STANDING COMMITTEES—EFFECT OF NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked the Speaker what would be the position of the two Standing Committees in view of the changes that would be made by the new rules of procedure.

*MR. SPEAKER: The conclusion to which I have come is that there is nothing in the new Standing Orders to abrogate the position of the two Standing Committees on Law and Trade; they will remain and continue to exercise the functions they have hitherto exercised and will dispose of the Bills committed to them, until such time, if any, as the House may take other action or until they have completed their work. If the House chooses to transfer the series of Bills which has been committed to the two Committees, to the new Committees to be appointed, that is a matter for the House to decide; but until that decision is come to it is the duty of the two Committees to continue and to dispose of the work committed to them by the House.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked if the House was to understand that, until the House otherwise ordered, there would be four Standing Committees in addition to the existing two.

*MR. SPEAKER: There cannot be six Committees; the House has not provided for them. The House has provided for four, and the two existing Committees will go on with their work until their labours are concluded, unless the House takes other steps and sets up two new Committees in lieu of them.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) inquired whether private Members would continue to retain the precedence on both the existing Grand Committees which they now possessed.

*MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the rules which regulate the working of the Grand Committees will continue to apply to them so long as these Grand Committees are in force.

NEW BILL.

HOME WORK BILL.

"To provide for the better regulation of Home industries," presented by Mr. Barnes; supported by Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Alexander Wilkie, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Charles Duncan, Mr. Summerbell, Mr. James Parker, and Mr. Steadman; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 158.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [15th April] to Question [20th March], as amended,—"(1) When a Bill has been a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to—(*a*) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills; or (*b*) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the

Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall without further debate put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words,—'(*c*) Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom. (*d*) Bills to give effect to treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements. (*e*) Bills to sanction the cession of any territory forming part of the dominions of the Crown.'"—(*Mr. Stuart Wortley.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said he wished to draw attention to the extreme importance of excepting from the operation of the Rule Bills which affected treaties, conventions, or other international arrangements. This was a serious question for hon. Members to consider, as they would realise when they remembered what occurred not so very long ago in connection with the New Hebrides, and what might occur again if the Prime Minister's proposals were carried without Amendment. Obviously a Convention which affected not only this country but France and our Australasian Colonies as well as the native and white populations of the New Hebrides, ought to have been fully discussed in the House itself. He would not, however, labour that point which had been so well put by the right hon. Member for the Hallam Division of Sheffield on the previous night, but he would appeal to hon. Members generally to consider carefully the importance of the power which they were being asked to part with. Then again there was the question of the cession of territory. Surely it would be a great innovation for the House to allow Bills of that nature to be removed from full discussion in the House. But he would pass from those points and deal with (*c*) affecting Bills to create a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom. That was indeed a very important matter, and in his opinion the right hon. Member for Hallam had not gone far enough in wording his Amendment. There had been statements both in and out of Parliament with regard to the proposed legislation for Ireland, and although he took it that the intention of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Hallam Division was to prevent the possibility of any question regarding Home Rule or any measure extending self-government in Ireland being removed from discussion on the floor of the House, he feared that after the contradictory statements made by various Ministers as to the intentions of the Government it would be necessary to widen the Amendment, so as to make sure that when the Bill was introduced—and he sincerely hoped it never would be—it would not be open for Ministers to claim that it was not really a measure which created a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom. What they had to fear was that a Bill might possibly be sent upstairs which, although professing not to be a Bill of the nature described in the clause, was really intended to lead up to a separate legislature for one portion of the United Kingdom, and he took it that the intention of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment was to prevent the possibility of such a Bill being sent upstairs. To make it clearer, however, he intended to propose, as an Amendment to that Amendment, to add after the word "kingdom" the words "or Bills which their promoters declare are intended to lead up to a subordinate legislature in any part of the United Kingdom." Those words would secure them against such legislation being relegated to a certain number of gentlemen upstairs. Although it was quite possible for the great majority now in power to defeat the proposal there ought to be a sense of fairness which would recognise that there was in the House a minority which really and sincerely feared the introduction of legislation of this kind, believing it would be seriously detrimental to the prosperity of their country, and feeling the necessity for the freest possible debate on all stages in the House itself. Had the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University been accepted in the spirit in which it was brought forward his own Amendment would not have been so necessary, as on the Report stage it would have been possible fully to discuss vital points raised in Committee; but as he understood the Prime Minister's Amendment it did not go so far as was promised. The fact was they had been betrayed, and consequently a safeguard had been taken away from them. In the past the House had shown itself most jealous in protecting the interests of minorities. There was no minority in that House so small and yet so excellently representative as the Irish Unionist Party, and it was in their interest that he moved his Amendment. He hoped that hon. Members' sense of fairness would incline them to give it due consideration, and to remove from the operation of the proposed Rule a Bill to which the Unionist Members looked forward with horror, and which if it were ever introduced ought to be subjected to full analytical criticism and debate in the House itself. He begged to move.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) seconded the Amendment. While agreeing with the first part of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Hallam Division, he felt that it required amplification in the way proposed by his hon. and gallant friend, and he sincerely hoped the House would see its way to adopt the suggestion. It seemed to be the desire of the Government to stifle discussion on all important questions, but inasmuch as the introduction of any measure tending to the establishment of a separate Legislature in any part of the kingdom would be a direct revolution in the policy of the country, such a measure ought to be fully and adequately discussed on the floor of the House, so that the discussion might come out fully in the Press, and the people of the country learn what was proposed to be done by the Government at the instance of their ardent supporters below the gangway. The adoption of his hon. and gallant friend's Amendment would preclude any possibility of a Bill obviously intended to set up a separate Legislature being sent upstairs instead of receiving adequate discussion on the floor of the House.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, after the word 'Kingdom,' to insert the words 'or Bills which the promoters declare are intended to lead up to a subordinate Legislature in any part of the United Kingdom.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said the noble Lord and the hon. and gallant Gentleman seemed to have a thorough conviction as to the contents and tendency of a measure which they had not yet seen. So far as he could he desired to calm the apprehensions, which he thought unnecessary, in the breasts of those hon. Members. There was no intention whatever of sending the measure to which the hon. Members referred upstairs. It would, from the beginning to the end of its, he hoped, fortunate and peaceful passage, be retained in the House, in the atmosphere of which hon. Gentlemen would have the infinite satisfaction of discussing it. But when they came to the insertion of general words in a Rule of this kind, especially such vague words as those proposed, he did not think any sensible Legislature would take such a course. He could only repeat that from beginning to end Bills of this kind would remain in the custody of the House, and the Government had no intention whatever of sending them upstairs.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) did not think that the Answer given by the right hon. Gentleman would be regarded as satisfactory by the mover and seconder of the Amendment. If the right hon. Gentleman had taken the trouble to follow the speeches of his own Leader, the Prime Minister, he would not be in such a state of ignorance as he now found himself. They presumed that the Prime Minister spoke with a full knowledge of the intentions of the Government, and he had left no doubt in the minds of his hearers that the Bill to be brought forward was one which would lead up to the larger measure of Home Rule. What could be the objection of the Government to stating in plain language what they meant? They were not dealing with an Order which was merely special in its character. They were altering the Standing Orders for all time, and it could be no answer to the objections raised on that side to say "You have a particular measure in your minds, and we say it is not going to be taken upstairs." What they asked was that it should be stated what measures were to be retained in the House. In the general discussion on the Prime Minister's proposal he raised a point which had never been answered, viz., what were the Government's intentions with regard to adverse decisions on Bills in Grand Committees. [Interruption.] It was of no use hon. Gentlemen interrupting him, he was in the hands of Mr. Speaker, who was quite competent to tell him if he were not in order, and the President of the Board of Education, by his interruptions, was showing that he had little regard for the time of the House. Supposing a Bill were introduced from which were carefully excluded powers which certain sections of the House desired to see included, and a combination were formed which carried against the Government a Motion that was vital to the Bill, the usual consequences would follow. What he asked the Chancellor of the Duchy was this: a Bill went upstairs, and if such a combination were formed, and the Government were defeated, what course did the Government propose to take, having regard to the amended procedure? Were they to regard the defeat upstairs in a Committee of eighty members in the same light as they would regard it in the House, or did they propose entirely to disregard the defeat upstairs and wait until the Bill came back to the House, making full use of the interval for the application of the usual arguments to hon. Gentlemen who had voted against them? They might entirely change the decision of Parliament by the very fact that they disregarded a decision upstairs, though that decision was vital to the Bill. He submitted that that was a constitutional question which the Government ought to answer.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that it was not the intention of the Government to send upstairs the Bill foreshadowed in connection with the Government of Ireland. Surely the time had gone by when they could place reliance on what was the intention of the Government in the matter. He thought, in any case, that it was a very weak argument for the right hon. Gentleman to use. Certainly, after what the right hon. Gentleman had said, it was not a question of the intention of the Government, but of what the Government were likely to do. What, in this case, were the Government likely to do if they found that their intentions were not likely to be received in the spirit in which they should be received by hon. Members below the gangway? But the Bill foreshadowed for Ireland was not the only Bill which his hon. and gallant friend had in view when he moved his Amendment. There were a great many other Bills that might be brought forward in the near future leading up to the provision of a separate Legislature. He hoped the Prime Minister would answer the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend, and give a rather fuller answer than that by the Chief Secretary.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said he would not be so discourteous as not to answer the right hon. Gentleman, who had appealed to him personally, although it was rather difficult to answer, especially after the speech which the noble Lord had just made. It was the kind of speech which he thought the noble Lord would regret when he had been a little longer in the House. The answer to the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly clear. The case which he put was a Government defeat by a combination in the Standing Committee on a point which the Government regarded as vital. Of course the Government, when the Bill came down from Committee, would take the course which all Governments took. The House would have to grapple with the situation as a whole. As to an alteration introduced by a casual combination of a very small minority compared with the whole House, the Government would tell the House, as Governments had already done, that when there was a clause put into a Bill which they regarded as vital to it, and which would impair what they considered the intention and purport and meaning of the Bill, they would take the usual course, and they would have to follow the course which the House thought best. They all remembered Mr. Gladstone's phrase, which was that—

"The Government regard this as vital,"

and the House knew what that meant.

MR. WALTER LONG: That statement was made during the progress of the Committee, and if the decision in Committee was adverse, the action which the Government would take would immediately follow.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said he thought that made the case stronger for the Government, for it then took it out of the discretion, after a final decision, of the Committee, which was not competent to decide questions on which the existence of the Government depended. It was not competent for eighty Members of the House to decide whether the Government possessed the confidence of the House of Commons. It would have been very hard on the late Government if that had been done in the past. It was rather difficult when the House was heated, but he appealed to the common sense of the House in this matter. They were told that they were practically rogues, but they were not fools, and they would act as common-sense men would do. He did not think that any Government had ever sat on those Benches which had not acted in accordance with the highest sense of what was due to the House and country when vital questions were before them.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said the statement which the right hon. Gentleman had just made was, he thought, the answer which his right hon. friend expected to get from him. But of course the House saw what it involved in a large number of cases—the ignoring by the Government of the decisions and labours of the Committees which they had gone to such trouble to set up. If the opinion of the Committee happened to differ from the opinion of the Government, the Government would reserve to itself the right to ask the House upon Report to go into the whole question again and reverse the decision of the Committee. If the Government reserved to themselves that discretion they would not dispute the right of every Member of the House to exercise the same discretion. If the Government had the right, it was also the right of the individual Member. Accordingly what they had to contemplate was that the Report stage would be far more arduous than at present, that decisions on the Committee stage would carry far less weight than they did now, and that the House on Report would constantly have the right to undo and do over again the work which had been done in Committee. The Chancellor of the Duchy had commented with some warmth on the speech of his hon. friend behind him. He thought it was needless warmth, and when the right hon. Gentleman thought of what his hon. friend had said, he would see that it did not call for the rebuke which, as an old Member, he had administered to his hon. friend. What his noble friend said was that they could not rely on the intentions of the Government.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: The noble Lord said that reliance could not be placed on the statements of the Government.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, the noble Lord said that reliance could not be placed upon the intentions of the Government, and it was a correction of the right hon. Gentleman which he made on his hon. friend's behalf.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER accepted the explanation.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that nobody would contend for one moment that the intentions of the Government at the present moment were binding upon them a couple of years hence, say; still less were they binding on any other Government. Without being offensive, he begged to recall to the House the fact that the Prime Minister himself had explained more than once the difference between an intention expressed by the Government and a pledge given by the Government. On more than one occasion they thought they had received a pledge from the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had corrected them, explaining that he had expressed an intention in the light of the Government's then knowledge and expectations as to the course of business, and he had resented pretty strongly any suggestion from the Opposition of a breach of faith. Intentions were not a very suitable basis on which to place Standing Orders. Only on Thursday last the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his intention to accept the Amendment of his right hon. friend the Member for Dublin University. That was the Prime Minister's intention, but his Amendment did not carry out that intention. From facts fresh in their memory, he submitted that his noble friend had said no more than what was obvious to any man when he stated that in making Standing Orders they could not rely on the intentions of the Government.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) felt that there was more substance in this Amendment than the right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench had realised even in regard to the particular Bill alluded to by the Chief Secretary. It would be within the recollection of the House that the Chief Secretary had assured his hon. and gallant friend that he did not need to be under any apprehension in regard to the Irish Bill, or as to whether it was intended to lead up to Home Rule. The Amendment before them really raised the big question of the reference of contentious Bills to Grand Committees. He thought he was right in saying that when the Grand Committee system was instituted in 1882 it was not Mr. Gladstone's intention that the Committees should be used for the discussion of highly contentious measures. Mr. Gladstone, speaking of these Grand Committees, said—

> "The Committees would consider only those subjects with which the painful considerations of Party cannot be mixed up."

The Chief Secretary had stated that the particular Bill referred to would not go to a Grand Committee, but the point they wished to press was, would Bills of that character go to a Grand Committee? The Government had already refused an Amendment which would have prevented Bills of a highly contentious character going to a Grand Committee. The Prime Minister, in the statement he had made, appeared to be contemplating the possibility of the Scottish Land Bill going to one of these Committees. When the right hon. Gentleman suggested that a Bill of that character might be sent upstairs he would remind him that in 1894, when the Scottish Committee was set up, it was said that it was perfectly plain that a Crofters Bill could not be referred to such a Committee. Upon the general question he would like to quote one of the greatest Parliamentarians, the late Sir William Harcourt. In the debates on the setting up of the Scottish Committee in 1894, an Amendment was moved defining what kind of Bills should be dealt with, and Sir William Harcourt said—

> "When the noble Lord asks me whether great Parliamentary questions such as the Land Acts, Home Rule, Disestablishment, and questions of that kind, which I call of a highly political and controversial character, are proper subjects for a Committee of this character, I have to tell him that that is not the object of a Committee of this character."

He went on to say—

> "That the Committee was to be used for measures which were not of a high political character."

That view was confirmed by Sir George Trevelyan, who went even further, for he said—

> "No Bill objected to by a large minority of the House would ever be referred to that Committee."

Then Sir George Trevelyan went on to say—

> "No Government, unless composed of nothing short of lunatics, would propose to bring any contentious Bill before a Grand Committee."

He reminded the Prime Minister that several times in the course of those debates the opinion was expressed that particular Bills would not be brought before the Grand Committee, on the ground that they involved high constitutional principles. If the Government had accepted the previous Amendment there would have been no necessity to move the one under discussion; but as they had refused a general Amendment these proposals were now necessary. With regard to the possible defeat of the Government in Committee, he assumed that the Government in forming these Rules were contemplating a code of procedure not only for this Parliament but to facilitate the work of the House in the future. But what would happen? There might come a time when some other Government would sit on the benches opposite. There might be a Conservative Government in power and Scotland might be represented by a majority of Radical Members. Under those circumstances to defeat a Committee would be a matter of daily occurrence, and then the Government would become a sort of political Penelope undoing what had been done on these Committees. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe appeared to suggest that the object of these Committees was to enable a Liberal Government to pass Liberal legislation. That might be a laudable object from the point of view of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but it was not a proper conception of the functions of any Committee of the House. He would again appeal to the late Sir William Harcourt, who said—

> "He would never be a Party to the breaking up of the control of the House of Commons as a whole over great questions which interested the whole country."

He went on to say—

> "To use any instrument of this kind to secure the predominance of a Party majority would be an abuse of power."

For those reasons he strongly supported the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy) thought the Opposition might very well rest satisfied with the declaration of the Chief Secretary that it was not the intention of the Government to send Bills dealing with Ireland to any of the Committees upstairs. With regard to the question whether the Government of the day ought to regard a defeat in Committee upstairs as equivalent to a defeat downstairs he could not understand the position taken up by the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin had complained that the Government would not regard a defeat upstairs in that light.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I did not say that; I simply asked the question.

Mr. DALZIEL said the hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire had referred to the position of a Conservative Government if there happened to be on the Scottish Committee a majority of Radical Members representing Scotland able to carry propositions upstairs which the Government would have to reverse downstairs. Did the hon. Member contend that Scottish opinion should not prevail when a Tory Government was in power? That was not the argument he used at the last general election.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON said it was quite right that Scottish opinion should prevail, but that did not necessarily mean Scottish Radical opinion.

Mr. DALZIEL said the representation of Scotland had been overwhelmingly Radical for many years. It did not appear to be recognised that the Government were making a very important departure so far as the whole administration of the House was concerned. If they were simply going to regard the new Committees as the embodiment of the old ones they ought not to be wasting time discussing these new proposals. The proposals of the Government were far-reaching and struck vitally at the whole business arrangements of the House with a view to taking away all those matters of detail which could be properly threshed out upstairs, thus leaving the time of the House free for the consideration of the greater questions which might come before them. In reading quotations from speeches made many years ago it was necessary to remember that they were now living under different circumstances. The present was a more democratic House of Commons than had been previously elected, and it was pledged to deal with certain reforms. It was because it was through the medium of these Grand Committees that those great objects were to be achieved that the majority of the House would support the proposal of the Government. As to the position of the Government in relation to the decisions of Committees upstairs, if there should happen to be an Amendment carried against the Government it would depend entirely on the relative importance of the Amendment whether the Government could accept it when the Bill came downstairs. The Minister in charge might accept it so as to speed the passage of the Bill through the House. It would always be in the power of the Government to reverse or to approve the decisions of the Grand Committees. The House would retain supreme power over all the deliberations of Committees upstairs. They would have that security on the Report stage.

*SIR ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs) said the difficulty was in knowing what was controversial matter. In the last Parliament, when the Musical Copyright Bill was introduced, he had the honour to submit to the then Prime Minister a request asking him to "star" it on the Order Paper. The petition was signed by forty-nine out of every fifty Members to whom it was presented. The Government of the day "starred" it, but it did not pass. When the present Government adopted a Bill introduced by Mr. Agar-Robartes, the Prime Minister justified the course he had taken in "starring" it by pointing to the Musical Copyright Bill as a highly controversial measure which his predecessor had starred. When the hon. Member for the Aston Manor referred yesterday to the Scottish Small Holdings Bill as a Bill so contentious that the Government would certainly not send it upstairs, Ministers shook their heads and led the House to infer that the Bill might be relegated to Grand Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has forgotten the Amendment which is now before the House.

*SIR ARTHUR BIGNOLD said he bowed to the ruling. He trusted that the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment, and that before the discussion was concluded that evening they would give the House some intimation of what they meant by a controversial measure.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he could not help thinking that the Government had chosen a method which was likely to lead to more controversy than was necessary in the proceedings of the House. He understood that the object of the Government in introducing this particular change in the Rules was to produce as much legislation as possible in a given time out of the Parliamentary machine. He did not find fault with that at the moment, but the objection of hon. Members on his side of the House was that the Parliamentary machine could only produce so much work in a given time. He ventured to suggest that the Government were applying the wrong remedy. The remedy was to produce less legislation, but of a better sort.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. and gallant Gentleman is discussing the Resolution as a whole. We have not arrived at that point yet. The only question now is whether Bills which, in the opinion of the promoters, may lead to the formation of subordinate Parliaments are to be kept here or sent upstairs.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD said he understood that, and he would not pursue the question as to the proper remedy.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said they had received from the Chief Secretary for Ireland a reply which was satisfactory as to the immediate measure which the Government proposed to introduce for Ireland, but it did not go far enough for himself and his friends. They held that all measures in the future which were so important that the Government themselves said they were intended to lead up to a separate Parliament were measures which ought automatically to be excepted from consideration by Grand Committee. His right hon. friend had moved an Amendment, but there was no reply from the front Government bench. He asked whether Bills of the class mentioned by his right hon. friend were not of such importance that they ought to be retained in the House. He fancied that the reply of the right hon. Gentleman to whom the question was addressed would probably be, "Yes, they are, and we do not intend that those measures should go upstairs." If that was so, why did the Government object to accept the Amendment? Why not put it in black and white in the Standing Order? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to accept the Amendment.

SIR FRANCIS LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) said the alteration of the

Rules of procedure should not be treated as a Party question. In the circumstances he was rather surprised that the Prime Minister had not met in a more conciliatory spirit the valid and reasonable objections to some of the proposals. He himself was in favour of a further extension of the principle of referring to Standing Committees some of the details of non-controversial measures, and if these alterations could be made in that spirit he would be disposed to support the Government in regard to a great many of them. It had been conclusively shown that a Bill of the character referred to in the Amendment did not come at all within that description. Any Bill which proposed to make an extensive alteration in the Constitution of the United Kingdom would be of a highly controversial nature. He thought, therefore, that was a class of Bill which might very well be excepted from the operation of the Rule. He appealed to the Prime Minister to say whether he could not introduce some general words which would exclude from the operation of the Rule Bills of a highly controversial character. He thought the present case would be entirely met if the right hon. Gentleman would include in the exceptions any Bill making any vital alteration in the Constitution of the United Kingdom. That would not in any way prejudice the position of the Government, because they had declared that they had no intention to send to the Grand Committees Bills of that character. The matter was of far too great importance to be left to the discretion of any Government. Now was the time for the Prime Minister to be a little conciliatory.

Lord WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) believed there were a great many Bills not of a highly contentious character which might fairly be discussed, and which might perhaps receive fairer treatment, in the Grand Committees than in Committee of the Whole House. That was partly owing to the fact that in order to vote Members had to be present at the moment the Question was put. On the other hand, he felt that a strong case had been made out for the acceptance of the Amendment proposed by the hon. and gallant Member. It seemed to him that this method of sending upstairs Bills of all descriptions relating to different parts of the United Kingdom contained within it a great danger. He had listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy, who was particularly anxious to show that in Scotland during the last twenty or more years the great mass of political opinion had been democratic. But he would remind the House that there had been in the past a different position in that country from that which now obtained. When the question of setting up Committees composed of Members for Scotland, Ireland, and Wales was first introduced the Liberal Party was in power, but commanded only a small majority, largely composed of Irish, Welsh, and Scottish Members, while the great proportion of the Members of the House were strongly Conservative Englishmen. That would happen again in the future, and he well remembered the late Lord Randolph Churchill pointing out that if they were going to set up Grand Committees for Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, they must give the same rights to England.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is a proposition down on the Paper later dealing with that point.

Lord WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY said what he wanted to urge was that the proposals of the Government would create a feeling in the country that they were advancing towards Home Rule all round —a principle which, he believed, would never be accepted by the majority of the people.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he presumed that right hon. Gentlemen opposite would admit that all the members of the Government should be accepted as promoters of the Bills mentioned in the King's Speech. The reason why he was strongly induced to support the Amendment of his hon. and gallant friend was that he thought it would have some considerable effect in putting an end to an unfortunate habit which had grown up in the country and was particularly noticeable at the last general election, namely, that of different members of the Government having different views as to Bills that were to be introduced. Sometimes it was found convenient for one member of the Government to declare that a certain Bill would not have the effect which some people imagined it would have; and another member of the Government, or possibly the same member, addressing another audience, would give an entirely different rendering of the effect of the Bill if passed. The proposal of his hon. and gallant friend would stop a great deal of loose talking and tend in the direction which he was sure the Government had in view—the retaining within the purview of the Whole House of such Bills as were set forth in the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 108; Noes, 329. (Division List No. 121.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,Rt Hon.VictorC. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain,RtHn.JA (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Glendinning, R. G.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F (BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,RtHon.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt Hon.Lt.-Col.A.R
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,Sir Gilbert(Gravesend)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W).
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon Arthur(Ormskirk.
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Captain Craig and Viscount Castlereagh.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert(Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,John Emmott(Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beacuhamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell,SirJ.H (Essex,Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, Williams
Bramsdon, T. A.

Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt. Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T. Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Jamuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkBg'hs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley,W. E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)

Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seavenrs, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor,TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfork)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

***SIR WILLIAM ANSON** (Oxford University) desired to say a few words on the Amendment, not with a hope of carrying conviction to hon. Members opposite, but because he wished to record his protest against carrying rules which he believed would be detrimental to the well-being of the House. What were the arguments urged by the Government for excluding from the purview of these Committees the very important matters which were included in the Amendment of his right hon. friend? They were referred again and again to the Report of the Procedure Committee of 1886, and that in fact was the only reason which the right hon. Gentleman had advanced for refusing to give attention to proposals to exclude matters of national or constitutional importance from the consideration of these Committees. The fact was, however, that the Report of that Committee had very little application to the present situation. What Committees did that Committee propose to set up under that Report? They were not *ad hoc* Committees, but the House was to be divided into four Committees who were to meet, each forming a quarter of the whole House, for the discussion of matters which were to come back to the House for discussion upon Report. That was a very different matter from the appointment of Committees *ad hoc* of sixty or eighty Members. In 1886 they had not realised the full effect of the legislation of 1885; they had not realised that the Redistribution Act of that year would work out in such a way that the elections might give to one Party or another a majority in the country quite out of proportion to the votes cast for it. He did not think the Report of that Committee was framed in anticipation of the enormous majorities which placed great and dangerous powers in the hands of a Government. Then again, closure, in those days, was in its infancy, and the idea of closure by compartments had not been introduced. If they wished to accelerate the business of the House he would venture to say that closure by compartments, determined upon in the initial stages of a Bill, was the best way to secure a full and reasonable discussion of the important parts. At that time, however, closure by compartments had not been considered, and, as he had said, closure in the ordinary form was in its infancy. At that time there was certainly no suggestion of the power of closure being given to the Chairman of any one of the four Committees which were contemplated in the Report of the Committee of 1886. That being so, the Report of that Committee was really inapplicable to the present situation. What other reasons for rejecting this Amendment had been assigned by the Government? Did they mean to send up as a matter of course these *ad hoc* Committees' Bills dealing with the great subjects which had been alluded to, or did they consider that it was beyond the range of possibility that a Home Rule Bill, or a Bill for the cession of territory or the like, should be sent up? If they considered it impossible why did they not say so? If they would say so, he did not wish to express any doubt as to the intentions of the Government, or to bring himself under the rebuke of the Chancellor of the Duchy, but this Government had taught them that a great many things were possible that they had hardly conceived to be within the range of possibility before the commencement of the session last year. Was it to be left within the range of possibility that such a Bill as the Home Rule Bill of 1893, that a Bill to carry out a commercial treaty—say the Sugar Convention Bill or the Bill for the cession of Heligoland—was to be dealt with by a Committee of sixty or eighty Members, upon which the Opposition might be very sparsely represented? Moreover, he would ask under what conditions the Government would allow the possibility of such a discussion to take place? These Committees would discuss matters without any authentic report being given of their proceedings. The Chairman would have given to him freely a power of closure which had only been gradually granted to the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees in the House, and was only given to the Deputy-Speaker now with a reservation. The public would not only know nothing or practically nothing of the course of the debate, but they would not know the reasons for which closure was given or the circumstances under which the debate had been curtailed, and they would have no means of judging of what had been the extent of the fair discussion allowed: this would depend on the idiosyncrasies of the particular Chairman of a particular Committee on a question of constitutional importance. They had heard in the course of the debate the sort of view which the Government took of these Committees, and it appeared that so long as a Committee did what the Government pleased and carried out its intentions they might alter the Constitution of the country and cede territory, make commercial treaties, and so on. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no."] These Grand Committees, as he understood it, were to have free power to deal with any subject, with the very limited exceptions included in the right hon. Gentleman's Rules, which might be sent before them.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) said the hon. Gentleman must not say that the Committee had this power of proceeding. The House of Commons had still some power somewhere. A Bill must be read a second time in the House, and then there was the Report stage and the Third Reading. The hon. Baronet was exaggerating.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he could assure the Prime Minister that he was quite familiar with the forms of the House, and had the right hon. Gentleman heard the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy he would have understood the purport of what he was then saying, which was not intended to be in disparagement of the ordinary procedure of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy was asked what would be the attitude of the Government when the Committee went against them on a question which the Government said was a vital one? The Chancellor of the Duchy said the action of the Committee would be remedied when the measure came down to the House; the Government would turn on its engine and upset the decision of the Committee. What, therefore, he wanted to point out was that it was rather a contradiction that a Committee of eighty Members might have the management of that very important stage, which was in the view of the country the most important stage of a Bill, they might have full power to deal with questions of the highest importance, but if they outstepped for one moment the wishes of the Government or lagged behind them the Government would not regard their decisions as vital, but they were to be set aside at once on the Report stage. There was in the contemplated procedure a possible arbitrary curtailment of debate by the powers of using the closure given to a possibly partisan Chairman. There was also a denial of publicity which he could hardly think the Government would wish to maintain. In fact, there would be no official report of these proceedings and no knowledge of the circumstances under which the closure was applied. He would also ask what would be the effect upon the general business of the House if these Committees were to deal with these very important subjects, which might come up every session, sometimes in several Bills. They would have four Committees of eighty Members, possibly one dealing with Home Rule, another with a commercial treaty, a third with the cession of territory, and a fourth with the reconstitution of the Army. These Committees would sit from eleven o'clock in the morning to four o'clock in the afternoon, and he would like to ask with what heart or energy would the members of those Committees come down to the discussion of a complicated Finance Bill, or the Report stage of a Bill hurried through the Committee by means of the closure upstairs, in the crude form in which Bills had in times within very recent recollection come down to that House. Unless some limit was put upon the subjects which might come before these Committees the business of the House might possibly fall into two sets of hands, those who attended Grand Committees and those who did not, and the ordinary items of discussion on administration and finance, and the subjects which would not be brought before the Grand Committees, including the Report stages of the Bills, would be dealt with mainly by the men who came fresh to work at four o'clock, and would be treated in a half-hearted way, if at all, by the jaded voluptuaries of Parliamentary work who had been sitting upstairs from eleven to four. He was afraid that the Government, in their desire to secure legislation which they wanted, were really doing a permanent injury to the House, and he appealed to the Prime Minister to reconsider that aspect of the question. The House was not merely a legislative machine, but the country looked to it for information on great political questions and for the best criticism that could be given on the conduct of the Government in all Departments of the State. The country also looked to the House for the best that could be learned of the details of all important measures before the House. That the country would not obtain if they worked the greater portion of the House to a standstill before four o'clock in the afternoon, and if they concealed from the public the discussion which took place in Committee on the Bills which were dealt with between eleven and four. The whole scope of the exceptions put forward by the Government was, to his mind, most disappointing and most unsatisfactory to anyone who cared, as he ventured to say he cared, for the due conduct of business in, and the high reputation of, the House. It had been his lot at one time or another to make some study of the institutions of the country, and he had studied them with admiration, and he would even add with reverence, and it was to him a matter of regret that he should see this Government, so strong in ability, so inordinately strong in numbers, stifling debate and trampling on legitimate opposition in order to carry Rules which he believed would gravely, if not irretrievably, impair the dignity, diminish the usefulness, and lower the reputation of the House.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he thanked his right hon. friend for the little compliment he had paid the Government. He was glad, and it was quite refreshing to find that anyone thought well of the Government at all after the sort of Whip which had been sent round to an admiring flock, to the effect that they were physically unable to sit up late at night, and mentally incapable of explaining or defending their scheme for strangling free debate in the House. If that was the gospel that had been preached behind the curtain for months past to the flock on the other side by their pastor and master, he was surprised that it should occur to one of the hon. Members opposite to use the words "most able." The superlative quite startled him. The hon. Baronet, if he would allow him to say so, had fallen into the error which had been proved to exist in all the speeches made on the Amendments moved upon the general question. If hon. Members were allowed to go according to their own sweet wills on such an occasion, it was a case of "Unconscious of their doom, the little victims play." They had so many hours in which they might employ themselves very usefully in discussing questions which deserved to be discussed, such as the question relating to the Scottish Committee. But, no, they preferred to play. As he had said, the hon. Baronet seemed to have fallen into an error which was saturated with fallacy. He talked of a Committee *ad hoc*. No doubt he had been so long at the Education Department, and when there had got so used to the phrase against which he protested, that it had so got into his mind that he must use it. The hon. Baronet called these Committees *ad hoc*, but they were nothing of the kind. Originally there was a distinction between the Committee on Trade and that on Law, but that had long since ceased to have effect and had disappeared. The hon. Member said what a dreadful thing it would be to have Bills dealing with treaties, Conventions, or other international arrangements, or Bills dealing with the cession of territory, referred to these Committees. Here he came to the little element of appositeness which he could find in the speech of the hon. Member. He had ventured to interrupt him and to point out that it was not the Committee but the House which sanctioned these things, because the latter passed the Second Reading, and therefore, if something prejudicial was enacted, the House would be as much to blame as the Committee. As a matter of fact, Bills which involved the cession of territory were not always very complicated. When Heligoland was ceded, the Bill only contained two clauses, one of which contained the short title, and the other simply provided for the assent of Parliament to the agreement between Her Majesty's Government and the Emperor of Germany as set forth in the schedule of the Bill, and set out that it should be lawful for the late Queen to do anything which was necessary or proper to carry into effect those provisions. The hon. Member seemed to think that they should exclude a Bill of that kind from going to any Committee, and that it ought to be reserved for careful and elaborate consideration by the House which had already assented to the principle of the measure as a whole. As to this Amendment, he founded himself on the legal maxim *exclusio unius est inclusio alterius*. If this Rule were passed, and went beyond excluding the traditional financial measures from the consideration of Grand Committees, it might be taken to involve that having specified those Bills all others were to go upstairs. That was not their intention, because they said that each Bill ought to be decided upon its merits. There might be Army Bills so exceedingly large and subversive of the existing condition of things that they ought to be considered in the House, but there might be others of such a slight character that they might not be excluded from the ordinary course. They must decide upon the merits of the case in each instance. It was said that that meant that the Government were to determine in each case, but he disclaimed the notion that their idea was to pass certain Bills which they liked. Let that be understood. Their object was to pass Bills with better consideration and greater speed than could be done at present; whether they regarded the Bills as good or bad did not enter into the matter at all. What he said was that the present system was cumbrous, slow, and ineffective. He had admitted from the first that this was a sweeping change. If it succeeded, as he hoped it would, and they had every reason to think it would, it would, he thought, make a great reform in the system of the House. It was not intended to, and he did not think it would, have the effect of benefiting one Party more than another. It was proposed merely to facilitate legislation and to assist the House in the discharge of its legislative duties. He had opposed all these special exceptions because if once, as he had said, they began to accept them they might exclude other matters which were as worthy of being excepted as those before them. He believed that it ought to be possible at the time for those best qualified to judge and who had the actual measures before them to say what the exceptions should be, but he thought it would be ill-advised to lay down any hard and fast rule as to the Bills or clauses which were to be excluded from the operation of the Rule.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the right hon. Gentleman was not making the Standing Order for this Government only, but was making it in what he conceived to be the interests of legislation over a period of years. He had introduced it in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the present House of Commons, or in the interests of the majority of any other House of Commons. He could only express regret that the Prime Minister's passionate desire to see legislation expedited, even though it was of a kind with which he did not sympathise, did not find expression in the last two Parliaments. He did not recall any occasion, when the late Government were dealing with the Rules of Procedure or bringing in their Bills, on which the Prime Minister had expressed his passionate desire to facilitate legislation, even though he might not approve of it, provided it had secured the support of the majority of the House. If that were, as he did not doubt it to be, the object of the Prime Minister and the Government, it was not the object with which some supporters were supporting the new Rule. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had frankly declared that his object was to pass Liberal legislation—Liberal in the Party sense; and the right hon Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe had said very much the same thing the other day. For his own part he desired to see the House more capable of directing its business than in the past when the legislation was supported by a great majority, and, at the same time, he thought hon. Gentlemen opposite were making a great mistake when they supposed that the Opposition did not wish to see legislation carried. In the past, when they commanded a majority, they had been active legislators, and they would be active legislators when they crossed the floor. Then no doubt they would reap any benefits which these Rules might give for the conduct of legislation through the House. It was not because these Rules facilitated legislation that he objected to them; it was because he thought that they would impede the proper consideration of legislation by the House, and be used, as the Government had already expressed the intention of using them, and as other Governments would use them increasingly, to withdraw power and control from that House. So much for the latter portion of the Prime Minister's speech. His hon. friend beside him had at last succeeded in extracting from the Prime Minister the principle on which they proceeded in drafting their Standing Order. He founded himself upon the legal maxim, *Exclusio unius est inclusio alterius*. That would have been a good argument if the Prime Minister had not excluded the financial Bills in accordance with immemorial practice. What the right hon. Gentleman said now was that he had excluded them because they had always been exceptionally treated by the House. But the two things were not the same. It would be in accordance with immemorial practice not to send contentious Bills upstairs, but the Prime Minister said he did mean to send such measures upstairs. The Prime Minister excluded finance Bills because they had always been exceptionally treated; yes, but not on the Committee stage. The special treatment of finance Bills was merely, in fact, that they must be founded on Resolutions introduced in Committee of Ways and Means and reported to the House. The procedure on finance Bills was applicable to all Bills with italicised clauses in them. Accordingly the distinction which the Prime Minister had drawn to differentiate finance Bills from other Bills broke down, because it had no reference to the particular stage which they were engaged in discussing. The right hon. Gentleman founded himself on a maxim which proved their case, and, if they passed the Rule in its present form, they had no security, whatever might be the intentions of the present Government, that they would not in future have a wide extension of the practice of sending Bills upstairs, and he, for one thought it not only possible but probable that such an extension would be made. Their only safeguard, if they meant to protect the right of the House to discuss these Bills in Committee of the Whole House, was to say definitely that they should be retained, and to say it definitely, not only in the form of speeches or intentions expressed across the floor of the House, but by words inserted in the Standing Order.

MR. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said that, from the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, if the Amendment were incorporated, it would be necessary to incorporate also, as an Amendment, something to provide for every clause which it was thought necessary or desirable, on the other side of the House, should be dealt with in Committee of the Whole House. That was not the scheme of the Government. What they were casting about for was some device whereby the House of Commons might become a business assembly. It was not to take away from the House a privilege which it might have upon the Committee stage; it sought to relieve the House of that business stage on a Bill. The general scheme of the Rule was that the Committee stage should disappear as regarded many Bills which could be dealt with more effectively upstairs than in Committee of the Whole House. If the Government were to adopt any Amendment or suggestion such as that under consideration, it would be necessary to incorporate in the Rule every class of Bill which it was desired to keep in the House. Of course that would not be practicable. ["Why?"] He would tell them why. They had on the Paper at the present moment Amendments which would include all highly controversial Bills. Nobody yet understood how these four Grand Committees were going to work. Everybody knew that this was an experiment. The Prime Minister had already said that he believed the experiment would turn out to be a good one. It was in the recollection of everyone that changes in Procedure had always been objected to. There was always a conservative tendency in the House of Commons—he did not mean in the Party sense—which went against making any alteration in the Rules; but alterations had been made which had turned out to be good and effectual remedies for the state of things against which they were aimed. He wanted to assume for the moment that this experiment of Grand Committees would turn out to be a good one. The Amendment before the House was to exclude expressly from the Rule a particular class of Bills.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University): I would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that it does not take away the power to make a Motion to send the Bill upstairs.

MR. EVANS was not at all sure that the right hon. Gentleman was right, for the Rule said in terms that they must keep in the whole House a certain class of Bills; he assumed that was definite. If the plan turned out to be successful, as he believed it would, then the House ought to be free to let every Bill without exception go upstairs. It seemed to be forgotten that there would still remain to the House the various stages of a Bill—the First and Second Readings, the Report stage, and the Third Reading. In all conscience was not that enough for practical discussion? It was only in respect of details that the Committees would be employed. He did not say that his side of the House had been guiltless in the matter, but it was perfectly certain that the Committee stage in the House had been often used, not for the purpose of improving a Bill, not for the purpose of bringing to bear upon that stage the business faculty of the House, but for the purpose of preventing the Bill from passing. It was to prevent a repetition of these things that this procedure had been proposed, and he was very glad that the Government were setting their face against all the exceptions which were proposed to be put into the Rule.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the hon. Gentleman had forgotten one thing. He had stated with perfect truth that the Committee stage had often been used in the past for the purpose of prolonging discussion. Nobody with any knowledge of the House of Commons denied that that had been the case in the past, or would doubt that analogous practices would be heard of in the future. But the hon. and learned Gentleman had made the great mistake of supposing that it could be avoided by withdrawing the details of Bills from the cognisance of the House. That was an impossible proceeding, and the Government, to do them justice, did not themselves contemplate it. They felt that the details must at one stage or another be thoroughly discussed in the House, and they had by an Amendment on the Paper expressed their intention of making, at any rate, some approximation on the Report stage to the freedom which was given on the Committee stage. The Prime Minister at an earlier period of the discussion had practically told the House that he meant to give full liberty on the Report stage. Therefore, they were all agreed that there must be a stage on every Bill in the House itself on which there could be ample discussion, and on which obstruction would be possible, and would, under certain circumstances, human nature being what it was, be practised. Nothing in the Rule would or could prevent that being done on one stage of the Bill, if the House of Commons had any control over the details of the measure. They were all agreed as to that. But they were all agreed, also, that there ought not to be two stages of the Bill in the House on which these practices could take place. He contended that limitations upon the powers of the House should be on the Report stage and not on the Committee stage. They were all agreed that the House should retain the liberty of dealing with details which ought to be dealt with when the Government were in a position to make proper changes consequent upon discussion. In regard to the practice of sending Bills upstairs, they would find that instead of making the two stages supplement each other, what was done under the limitations of a Committee upstairs would often hamper the House in the work to be done on the Report stage. It could be shown with conclusive mathematical certainty that the manning of these Committees must be of an imperfect character, and even if it were perfect they would not carry authority. The result would be that the House would come fresh to the matter unfettered by anything which had been done upstairs, they would refuse to be bound by the decisions of the Standing Committees, and would refuse to allow the fact that the details had been threshed out upstairs to diminish the discussion which they thought necessary downstairs. While he agreed that there should be some limitation to the double opportunity of dealing with the details of a Bill, they could not give that power without at the same time giving some opportunities for obstruction. The longer the discussion went on the more he was convinced that the Government had taken a wrong course in dealing with the Committee stage in the way proposed. The proper course would have been to leave the House a reasonable liberty on the Committee stage, and cut down to the narrowest possible limits the power of spending time—and sometimes wasting it—upon the Report stage.

*Sir HENRY FOWLER said that one matter which had not been mentioned was even worse than obstruction, and that was that Bills had been and would be obstructed not on their merits or demerits but to prevent some other Bill being reached. They had to leave it to the House to decide whether the plan of the Government for dealing with the details through the machinery of Grand Committees should be more generally carried out, or whether they should still go on with the old system and either do away with the Report stage or reduce it to a very small truncated stage. They had been talking about grave constitutional changes which the House wanted to reserve power to deal with. He had no fear whatever upon that point, because he was satisfied that the House would take good care of itself and would not endeavour to carry through Grand Committee any Bill upon which public opinion had been strongly excited. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London in his evidence before the Committee upstairs said—

> "It seems to me that a great blot, the greatest of all blots, upon our procedure at this moment is the fact that session after session goes by, and Bills to which nobody, or, at any rate, very few really object on their merits are handed on from session to session, and perhaps from Government to Government, without becoming law. No political credit is to be got out of them, no Government gains by them or loses by them, and the only people who lose are the public or the public service; and the Opposition of the day, or a few individuals even on the Government side, are quite sufficient to stop those Bills from getting through, if they have to run the ordeal of the Committee stage, the Report stage, and all the rest of them."

That was absolutely true. His opinion of these Rules was that they presented a reasonable prospect of dealing with Departmental Bills of the greatest importance to local and general administration which were outside Party questions, and by which no Party gained or lost, although the public lost by their not being passed into law.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 113; Noes, 353. (Division List No. 122.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, RtHn A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt Hn G(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn, Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thoss. H. A.E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.[
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(Bury S.Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt. H. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir BerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrnog, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, SirJ.H.(Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrey, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W.J.(S.Pancras, W.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.

Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W.H.(St Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford,S.
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn. HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davis, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen,W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset,
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Newnes,F.(Notts,Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall,Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,John(Kildare,N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce,Robert(Staffs.Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford, Pembroke
Philipps,OwenC.(Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E.(Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J.D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott Bradford
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon]
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A. H. (Aston-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw,Rt.Hon.T.(Hawick,B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,ThomasF.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker,H.DeR.(Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,SirJohnL.(Leeds,S.)
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackman'n)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White,Patrick(Meath,North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,SirThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson,P.W.(St.Pancras,S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) moved an Amendment to exempt from the operation of the Standing Order Bills affecting the Constitution of any of the Colonies or their relations with this country. In spite of the fate of the previous Amendment he had still some hope that the Government would accept this Amendment. There had never been any great change in the Constitution of any Colony which had not been preceded by a long period of agitation. He instanced the cases of Canada and Australia, where the Colonies had had every opportunity of discussing constitutional changes from every standpoint many years before they were carried into effect. The proposals were thrashed out in presence of the public. Let them imagine a Bill for the federation of South Africa being brought to that House and being sent upstairs to a Committee. The Chancellor of the Duchy would say that the Government would naturally not send such a Bill upstairs. But the Government by their present action were putting bounds upon what might be called the liberties of private Members of the House, because in a Committee upstairs the whole House would not be represented. The Government in the proposed Standing Order said in effect: "Though Bills may go upstairs automatically, we reserve to ourselves the right to retain certain Bills, if we choose, for the consideration of the House in Committee." There were a great many in the House who thought that the power of the Executive was increasing beyond reason. To whatever Party the Government of the day might belong, he thought it wholly unwise to allow it discretion to say whether Bills of this sort should be sent upstairs to the Grand Committees. As a matter of high constitutional procedure he thought it should be put on record that Bills dealing with the Constitution of the Colonies or the relations of the Colonies to the Mother Country should be reserved for the consideration of the Whole House. What would the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Colonies think if they were told that it was in the discretion of the Government in power in this country to send a Bill dealing with the Constitution of their own nation to a Commitee of eighty members upstairs, where the debates would not be reported, and where there would not be the same opportunity for the expression of divergent views as in that House? He thought that to leave this discretion to the Government of the day would be, though unintentional, an indignity to the Colonies. If the present Government would not send such Bills upstairs, did they trust future Governments not to do so? [AN HON. MEMBER: Not if they are Tory.] The hon. Member below the gangway had helped him in his argument. He wanted to remove it from the discretion of any Government. We were in the fortunate position in this country of having an unwritten Constitution, but in the United States it would take seven or ten years to alter the Constitution. Bills might deal with matters vital to the welfare, the national life, and the future of the Colonies, and the House should allow no discretion whatever to the Government in such matters. If the opinion of the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Colonies were asked, their reply would be in consonance with his own opinion, that questions affecting their Constitution should be reserved for the consideration of the Whole House. Bills vitally affecting the relations of this country with the Colonies should be put in that high treasury of procedure which reserved the consideration of such matters for the Whole House. He begged to move.

*MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn), in seconding the Amendment, said he was afraid that the House would not accept it after the speech which the Prime Minister had made. The right hon. Gentleman had practically said that they must accept the proposed alterations as they stood, or leave them, for no Amendment moved on that side of the House would be acceptable to him or his Party. The right hon. Gentleman had forgotten what took place in the House in 1882, when Mr. Gladstone moved the appointment of two Standing Committees, one Bills relating to law and shipping, and the other for trade, commerce and manufactures. Mr. Gladstone then stated that there must be some Bills dealing with Imperial Questions which it would be improper to refer to the Committees upstairs, and that ought to be retained for Committee of the Whole House. On that occasion Mr. Gladstone strongly deprecated any idea of forcing through the House by closure or otherwise any drastic changes in the Rules, and described such a course as "inexcusable and stupid." That was the very course which the Prime Minister was following that night. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Gravesend dealt with Bills affecting the constitution of the Colonies or their relations with this country.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) asked if the Amendment included Crown Colonies?

*MR. REMNANT said he included the self-governing Colonies. The Colonies were not, at the time referred to, so strongly in the minds of the people of this country as they were to-day. In a speech made at the Colonial Conference the previous day one of the Premiers said that the sittings of the Conference should be held in public in order that a correct statement of its proceedings should be accessible to those who lived in the Colonies; but if the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman was carried out, and such Bills were sent to a Committee upstairs, there would be no authoritative report of the proceedings. Hon. Members knew how difficult it was to find out any authoritative statement as to what had taken place in Committees upstairs, and those who lived in the Colonies would find still greater difficulty. He hoped that the House and the Government would acknowledge that this was a reasonable Amendment and accept it.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words '(c) or Bills affecting the constitution of any of the Colonies or their relations with this country.'"—(*Sir Gilbert Parker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) moved to insert in the Amendment after the word "their," the words "civil or military." If the Government had any intention of accepting the Amendment—and he supposed there could be no objection to that—he thought it would be better if the words he had suggested were added in order to emphasise the real reason for excluding this type of measure from being sent to a Grand Committee. It had occurred in the past that the lack of discussion on military proposals had caused difficulties in the Colonies. In Bills relating to civil and Army matters the fundamental difficulties only arose in Committee; a former Secretary for War had experience of that, the fact that the Colonial Premiers did not understand the details of the proposals made in Committee having led to some bitterness, or at any rate to some feeling. Speaking with great respect as one who had only seven years experience of the House, he thought it would be highly undesirable that an Army Bill should be discussed in Grand Committee, because all such Bills must affect all the Colonies in different degrees. It might be said that the Army Bill now before the House for the formation of a Territorial Army did not affect the Colonies, but it ultimately would have an influence on what the Colonies would do in regard to their Territorial Army. It would be remembered that in 1902 the Colonial Premiers had never plainly realised the difficulties of the proposals which had been appealed to them. The one thing which had hindered our relations with the Colonies in the past had been not the lack of discussion, but the lack of publicity of that discussion.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR, in seconding the Amendment, said he wished it had gone a little further. The hon. and gallant Member only proposed to insert the words "civil and military," but no one knew better than he the inter-dependence of the Naval and Military forces in the defence of the Colonies. He therefore suggested that his hon. and gallant friend should include "naval" as well as "civil and military" in his Amendment. He thought that in any discussions in the House affecting the defence of the Empire as a whole it was eminently desirable that the Bills should be discussed in Committee of the Whole House, and not in Committee upstairs.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the word 'their,' to insert the words 'civil or military.'"—(*Major Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said he would have liked the Government to have replied to the arguments in favour of the Amendment from the Opposition side of the House and from two respected adherents of their own. For his own part he thought that the really important question was whether the exemptions from the Rule should be in matters affecting the relations of the Colonies with the Imperial Government. His hon. friend the Member for Gravesend had spoken of the years of agitation which had preceded the establishment of the Dominion of Canada and of the Commonwealth of Australia, and had dwelt on the effect that would have been produced in Canada and Australia if the Bills for constituting the Dominion and the Commonwealth had been discussed not in Committee of the Whole House, but in Committee upstairs, where the Colonies would not have been able to obtain any detailed information on a subject which had engaged their interest for so many years. He agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division that the really important matter was publicity. Let them take the analogous case of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council —a most august tribunal. How would that tribunal be regarded by our friends across the seas if they saw it in actual session? They would see a dusty room in which a few elderly gentlemen were gathered round a table. They would hear able arguments, but they would not consider that the great Imperial Court of the Empire was sufficiently august in appearance in dealing with matters which might affect them. Supposing an Australian were to visit this country at the time of the passage of a great constitutional measure affecting the colony, would he think it seemly or consistent with the dignity of the subject, to see a Bill which had exercised his country for five years being discussed and settled, practically irrevocably, in Committee-room No. 15 by thirty or forty Gentlemen, with no official report. That was not at all an imaginary picture by any means. Surely it would be deplorable that, while a cricket match would be reported at great length, through the cables, the details of a great constitutional measure affecting the Colonies should be relegated to a Committee upstairs.

MR. DALZIEL said he could not see that there was any case made out for the exemption of Colonial Bills, because if any serious matters arose those Bills would come within the category of Bills which the Government of the day were to consider as to whether they should stay in that House or go upstairs. He could not understand the complaint with regard to the want of publicity. At the present time the proceedings in Grand Committees were reported. Reporters were admitted, and the proceedings were reported if they were of public interest. With regard to the general question of reporting, it was a question for the Government to consider whether they ought not to have official reports of these Committees. There would doubtless be many occasions when it might be necessary to refer to what had taken place in the Committees; to what the Minister in charge of a Bill upstairs had said; to what was actually done and what the issue was upon which a division was taken. It was well worth consideration, therefore, whether there ought not to be an official report of all the Grand Committees. He did not think this Amendment should be accepted.

Viscount HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said he would not have intervened if the Government had taken the more usual course on these occasions of answering the arguments urged against them not only by the Opposition but by some of their own supporters. Had it not been for the statement of the Prime Minister that it was his intention not to accept any Amendment to the proposed Standing Orders, he could not have conceived that the Government would refuse this Amendment. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had truly said that this Amendment was of no greater importance than other Amendments of a similar character which had been proposed. The astonishing thing to the Opposition was that the Prime Minister had not accepted the other important Amendments. The Government had great confidence in their own wisdom. That was a confidence which they could not expect the Opposition to share, because it was not shared even by all members of the Government Party. The Opposition did, however, trust the Government in this matter. What they felt was that they could not say what the action of future Governments might be. The right hon. Gentleman might be able to pledge his Government not to send any Colonial Bill upstairs, but he could not pledge future Governments. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy had recently said that these Committees could not under any circumstances decide the fate of a Government. That would have to be decided later on when the question at issue came before the House on the Report Stage. If these Committees were incompetent to decide the fate of the Government, they were incompetent to deal with such important questions as were referred to in the Amendment.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he had not thought it necessary to occupy time, because he had only the same Answer that he had given over and over again. The Government could not accept any additional exceptions to the Rule. They refused them all on the same ground, that, if they put in an exception of this sort, they implied that everything else was to go to the Standing Committee, without any alternative. What the Government said was that every question must be dealt with on its merits at the time. There might be many Bills which it would not be desirable to treat otherwise than in Committee of the Whole House. With regard to the picture conjured up by the ingenuity of the late Secretary of State for the Colonies of the New Zealander sitting on a broken arch of Westminster Bridge and viewing with contempt the shabby arrangements made for dealing with Bills from his own country, he need only point out that if there was any force in the consideration it would be for a future Government to give effect to it.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) asked for an Answer to the Question as to whether an official report would be made of the proceedings in the Committees and circulated in *Hansard.*

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that that had nothing to do with the Amendment.

Sir GILBERT PARKER said he would accept the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Proposed words there inserted in the proposed Amendment.

Question put, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 112; Noes, 327. (Division List No. 123.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks

Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S).
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross. Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan Robert (Lanark, Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES,—Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Remnant.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles

Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, ColonelIvor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)

Lever,W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R.(Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F, (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond,John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.

Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T. F. Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. Norwich)
Robertson, Rt.Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, HerbertL. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon.T.(Hawick,B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, ThomasF.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H.J.(Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds,S.)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walker
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley,John Henry(Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)	Winfrey, R.	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)	Wood, T. M'Kinnon	
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)	Yoxall, James Henry	

*EARL PERCY moved the Amendment (standing in the name of the hon. Member for the Central Division of Hull) to except from the operation of the Rule Bills affecting the government and administration of India. The Prime Minister had stated so explicitly that he would accept no further exceptions to the Rule that he moved the Amendment with some hesitation. But he moved it with the object of obtaining some expression of opinion from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who had been closely connected with the administration of India, as to the expediency or inexpediency of referring Indian Bills to the new Committees. There were circumstances which differentiated Bills affecting India from the kind of Bill the House had now been discussing. Nobody pretended that the legislative interests of India had suffered under the existing system. Secretaries of State for India had not been great legislators in the past, measures which had been recommended by the Indian Government had waited for sixty years before Secretaries of State had been found ready and willing to embody them in Bills. Bills affecting India were never controversial, at all events in a Party sense; any attempt to obstruct such Bills would be regarded as a scandal, and practically there was no difficulty, however late it was in the session, in getting these Indian Bills through the House and passed into law. In that respect they enjoyed exceptional facilities already. Moreover, India was not represented in the House, and the great advantage of discussions in Committee of the Whole House was that they got the benefit of the knowledge of those who were practically acquainted with the affairs of India from personal experience. Nothing could be more inappropriate than to send these Bills to a Committee upstairs, composed on a Party basis, where proceedings were not reported, or not reported fully, and where they had no absolute guarantee that they would secure the presence of those who were conversant with the problems involved. The withdrawal of Indian Bills from the House would constitute a serious departure from precedent, and would be understood in India, he thought, as implying even greater impatience in that House of Indian affairs than was imputed to them at present. On these grounds he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would at all events make this one exception to the rule.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, '(c) or Bills affecting the Government and administration of India.'"—(*Earl Percy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said the Prime Minister had already stated the intention of the Government to allow no exception whatever. The question as to whether a Bill should be referred to a Standing Committee or to the Whole House would have to be settled on its own merits. The Secretary of State for the time being would be the best judge as to whether there should be any departure from the ordinary course of procedure. Legislation with respect to India was exceedingly limited. With one exception in the last ten years Indian business had consisted of financial arrangements for the issue of loans and other matters, which had been very fully discussed in the House, but by a very limited number of Members. There would be no injury done to India by this Rule. The Government could not consent to any exception. Each question must be dealt with at the time, and in the circumstances of the time, having regard to the opinion of the House and of the country.

Question put, and negatived.

SIR E. CARSON then moved to add the words "Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order, a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House." He regretted exceedingly, he said, that the Prime Minister, through no fault of his own, was unable to be present while he dealt with this Amendment. Anybody who had followed the course of the proceedings upon these Procedure Resolutions would not wonder that he moved this Amendment, nor could he help expressing considerable regret at the way in which the Prime Minister had acted in reference to the question. When he was in the House yesterday he heard the Leader of the Opposition challenge the Prime Minister directly with an absolute breach of faith in connection with this Amendment, and from that time to this the Prime Minister had never denied the charge. That was not a pleasant state of things to exist. He did not mind so much that the right hon. Gentleman had never denied the charge, but he thought that he might at least have given some explanation of the course he had taken. Whether they would have an explanation he did not know, but at all events he did not think that they would have it from the Prime Minister himself. So far as he was concerned he would have preferred that anything unpleasant which he had to say should have been said in the presence of the Prime Minister rather than in his absence. His Amendment was a perfectly plain and distinct one, and had exactly the same meaning to-day that it had on Thursday. He would add that anything that he might say would have the same meaning to-morrow that it had to-day. It was a cheap way of getting rid of Amendments to make promises when those promises were not kept. It was, after all, only a difference, as had been pointed out, between a statement and an intention; but he would be able to show that they had both the statement and the intention. The necessity for the Amendment arose from the fact that everybody admitted that the House on some stage of a Bill ought to have absolutely free discussion as to its details, and it was with a view to obtaining that discussion that he had put down his Amendment; and he believed it was with that view that the Prime Minister originally accepted it. He appealed to the generosity of the Government, which they knew to be one of their supremest qualities, to inform them as to the manner in which these Committees would work as regarded the minority, which was of very small proportions at the present time. He knew that some hon. and right hon. Gentlemen thought that the smaller the minority the more they ought to be gagged. On some of the Committees the minority would not be able to be represented at all, or at any rate very inadequately. If that was so, surely there was all the more reason that when a measure came from Committee to the House, they should have an opportunity of discussing it just as if the Committee Rules applied. He believed that any Members who had taken part in Committee work would agree that the way in which the House and country got educated in the details and real effect of any Bill was by discussions in Committee. If the House was not satisfied with his statement on that point he could refer them to the statement of the Prime Minister on Thursday last. He did not want to take out of the speech of the Prime Minister anything that was not in it. The Prime Minister said—

> "There was an Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University, which said:—'Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House.'"

Then the Prime Minister went on to say—

> "That would give the House in the case of a Bill considered upstairs the power to discuss it as if they were in Committee. Without binding himself to the exact words of this Amendment, the Government were perfectly willing to accept it in spirit."

The spirit of that Amendment was that the right hon. Gentleman would give the House in the case of a Bill considered upstairs the power to discuss it as if they were in Committee. Proceeding, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Therefore there ought not to be so much apprehension as there appeared to be that the Government wished to impose undue restrictions to the powers of the House itself."

Later on in the debate the Prime Minister said—

> "While all other Amendments of the kind were to be rejected, his Amendment he was prepared to accept."

The Prime Minister made that statement after fuller consideration, and later on he stated that—

> "He had already said that the Government would enlarge the liberties and privileges of Members on the Report stage."

Had the Prime Minister accepted the spirit of his Amendment? He had provided that two Members of the House should have the right to discuss a Bill as if they were in Committee. It was probably a terminological inexactitude in which the right hon. Gentleman used the word "House" as meaning two Members of it. He denied that that was accepting the spirit of his Amendment. On the contrary it was killing the spirit, and leaving them a mere corpse. The facts were there recorded, and he would await with interest the explanation. The Prime Minister, referring to himself in the course of the debate, stated that he could not understand the ingratitude of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin in not rising at once and proclaiming how pleased he was that he should be honoured by the Prime Minister, and singled out as one whose Amendment would be accepted. He congratulated himself upon possessing in this case a prophetic instinct that it would be far better to wait for the performance of Liberal promises before expressing gratitude for them. He ventured to say that in the annals of their debates the right about-face of the Prime Minister upon this question was almost unparalleled. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order, a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House.'"—(*Sir E. Carson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman, who knew that the report he had read was a most incomplete and inadequate statement of the speech of the Prime Minister, had chosen to base himself upon some garbled extracts, which were not, in fact, the whole of the reported speech, in order to substantiate this very absurd charge of breach of faith. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] The right hon. Gentleman was in the House when the Prime Minister made that speech, and he must have heard every word of it.

Sir E. CARSON said he quoted from three speeches, and he heard two of them delivered.

Mr. McKENNA said that at any rate the right hon. Gentleman heard the Prime Minister use his arguments in favour of accepting his Amendment in spirit. The argument which the Prime Minister used was that very strong objection had been taken by the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that if a Bill was discussed in the House only on Report, the Minister in charge would be under great disadvantage if he were not allowed to speak twice. The Prime Minister could not, on that Amendment, elaborate the argument for or against the words put forward by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. But his right hon. friend threw out as an offer to hon. Gentlemen opposite, basing himself on the views of the Leader of the Opposition, that he would accept in principle the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. If his memory served him right, the Prime Minister went further than that, and referred to the fact that during the Committee stage of a Bill it was very rare indeed that a private Member, unless it happened to be the hon. Member who moved the Amendment, desired to speak more than once. That was the view of the Prime Minister, and certainly he had that in view when he spoke of accepting the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Member opposite in principle. What had the Prime Minister done? The fact was that the argument of the Leader of the Opposition in favour of the Minister in charge speaking twice was a very powerful one. The Prime Minister had also in mind the fact that the mover and seconder of an Amendment were very often placed at a disadvantage, if they were dealing with a complicated and difficult matter, in not being able to speak more than once, especially if the Minister in charge of the Bill gave a perfunctory answer without dealing with the merits of the case. It might also be that in such a case it was only the mover of the Amendment who had sufficient knowledge to inform the House that the reply given was insufficient, and it was necessary that he should be able to speak a second time. Those were the views of the Prime Minister, and those were the only cases which had to be met. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."] He challenged any hon. Member opposite who had had experience of the protracted Committee stages of Bills in the House to deny the accuracy of his statement when he said that it was a rare occurrence that any hon. Member desired or attempted to speak more than once during the discussion of an Amendment on the Report stage. That was a matter of fact which could easily be fortified by a reference to the debates. He had had ten years experience in the House, and his statement was justified by that experience. The Prime Minister, desirous of meeting the views of hon. Members opposite and of meeting the particular difficulties of the case, did make the promise, and he submitted to the House that the right hon. Gentleman had fulfilled that promise in the most complete form. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite need not imagine that they were to be moved by those shouts of "Oh." He remembered that in the last Parliament if any argument was raised on the opposite side of the House which could get no answer from the Government, the Prime Minister of the day used to come down and charge hon. Members on the Opposition side with making a personal imputation on the honour of Members. Now that hon. Gentlemen were themselves sitting on the Opposition side the tune was different. Now they had constant allegations of breach of faith. Neither one statement nor the other had the slightest foundation in fact. When hon. Gentlemen were bankrupt in argument there was nothing to rely on except these absurd charges. [Cries of "Oh."] On the merits of the proposal of the right hon. and learned Gentleman it was obvious that it went much beyond the needs of the case. What was proposed by the Prime Minister provided that the mover of an Amendment and the Member in charge of a Bill should have the right to speak as if they were in Committee of the Whole House. He thought sufficient had been done to meet the necessities of the case. The Prime Minister had not only fully carried out the promise which he made, but he had gone further and introduced the Amendment in a form which would be most satisfactory in the working of the Rules of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had misrepresented, unintentionally, what occurred the other night; he had misrepresented what occurred in the last Parliament. He never recollected a case, which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think occurred so frequently, in which he was charged with breach of faith, and he certainly remembered no case in which that charge could properly be made. Whenever there was, as was inevitable, an occasion of misunderstanding between the two sides of the House, his invariable practice was to give way on the point, because he thought that nothing was worse for the House than that doubt should arise on the assurances given by Ministers with regard to the conduct of business. Those were not the principles of the present occupants of the Treasury Bench. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Withdraw."] They were not the principles on what that bench now acted. The thing was really beyond dispute. It must be remembered that in the fullest and most explicit manner he stated, yesterday, exactly what their feeling was upon this point, and the grounds which justified that feeling. The Prime Minister had an opportunity of replying, of making a personal explanation if he wished to do so, of giving an answer in the ordinary course of debate, and he remained silent. And if he had nothing better to say than what had just been said on his behalf by the Minister for Education, he was bound to say he thought the Prime Minister was well advised. He pointed out yesterday that, not only had they on that side of the House taken the obvious view of the Prime Minister's promise, but that his own supporter in the person of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had also taken the same obvious view.

MR. MCKENNA: The right hon. Gentleman has referred to my hon. friend the Member for Kirkcaldy. He probably has forgotten the fact that the Prime Minister was not in the House when my hon. friend spoke.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was right in his recollection or not, but it did not touch the essence of his argument. The point of his argument was that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy represented many of the supporters of the Prime Minister, and when they had this universal recollection of what the Prime Minister said, and they had that recollection confirmed by the reports in the Press the next day, what was the use of trying to gloss over, as the right hon. Gentleman tried to gloss over, the real purport of the Prime Minister's statement? The Prime Minister's pledge went far beyond that of dealing with the particular argument he had put forward as to the unfair position in which the Minister in charge of a Bill was placed on the Report stage, and the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment now on the Paper went beyond dealing with that argument. But he frankly admitted that it was not so much with the merits or demerits of the Amendment as with the pledge that the Prime Minister gave that he was concerned, and nobody who heard his successive speeches would have the hardihood to get up and say that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy, that his right hon. friend near him, and that he himself were all wrong in their recollection of what that pledge was.

MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that he heard the Prime Minister's speech and the speech of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy, and he felt very strongly that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy was exaggerating very greatly what the Prime Minister said.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether the hon. Member did not hear the Prime Minister say quite distinctly that he was going to give the Members of the House the privileges on Report that they possessed in Committee. The right hon. Gentleman said so. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No."] He heard him say so; the right hon. Gentleman was reported in *The Times* to have said so, and he did not believe it was open to, or capable of, doubt.

MR. MCKENNA: The words are not quite that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR replied that, in the first speech, which, he supposed, was the most operative one, the Prime Minister, after quoting the words of his right hon. and learned friend's Amendment, said—

> "That would give the House, in the case of a Bill considered upstairs, the power to discuss it as if they were in Committee."

Therefore, the Prime Minister knew exactly what the proposition said and what was the spirit of it, the spirit of his own definition, and he went on to say—

> "Without binding himself to the exact words of this Amendment, the Government were perfectly willing to accept it in spirit."

The right hon. Gentleman spoke at least twice after that, and he made no qualification of that statement. Why, even the present Government would hang a criminal on that evidence. What influence had made the Prime Minister go back on this clear and undoubted statement he could not imagine, but he ventured to think that it would be to the credit of right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and in accordance with the best traditions of the management of business in the House, and of the highest traditions of Parliamentary practice and principle, if they retraced the step so hastily made, and did that now which only last Thursday the Prime Minister so clearly and explicitly told the House it was his intention to do.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said he was present in the House and had a conversation with the Prime Minister before his right hon. friend made the speech referred to. The Prime Minister referred to the speech which the Leader of the Opposition had made, and said to him that the argument in that speech had made a very great impression upon him, and that he found a great deal of force in it. Unfortunately the Prime Minister could not be present just then, and the Government had anticipated that this Amendment would have come on much earlier in the afternoon. He would, however, read to the House what was the argument of the Leader of the Opposition that had left an impression on the Prime Minister's mind. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I have had a long and painful experience of carrying controversial Bills through the House, and if the Committee will allow me I will explain exactly where I think the difficulty would occur on the Report stage. A Member gets up and moves an Amendment; possibly he may not be a very experienced Parliamentarian, not improbably he may not know the full strength of the case which may be made

for his Amendment. Now the House always insists that as soon as an Amendment is moved or, at any rate, very soon after an Amendment is moved, the Member of the Government in charge of the Bill, or one of his colleagues, shall get up and say what line the Government mean to take upon it. Now, if the Member in charge of the Bill knows his business he will not make a longer or more elaborate reply than the case so far made in the House seems to warrant. He probably knows that a great deal more may be said in favour of the Amendment than has been said; but he would be foolish if he suggested these new topics for discussion. He always hopes (sometimes against hope) that the real importance of the matter will escape his critics, and he frames his answer so as to be adequate, but not more than adequate, to the case that has been made. On the Report stage, when he has done that, he has exhausted his right of speaking. Then somebody else gets up on the other side of the House, who makes the case which ought to have been made, but was not made at first. The attack develops along the whole line; and the unfortunate Minister in charge of the Bill, although by the courtesy of the House he is sometimes allowed to speak again, always speaks again under the greatest difficulty, because it would be very bad taste to introduce the smallest controversial aspect into a speech which is only made by favour, and not by right. The briefest indication of his real reply is all he feels entitled to give. It is quite true that in the case of a difficult Bill the Minister in charge has aids and assistants, and they can do something to help him, but I believe that difficult Bill can only be steered by one man, and that though the assistance he gets is very important, the responsibility rests upon the Minister really in charge of the Bill, who knows what has been said, who understands the temper of the House, who is prepared to make concessions, if they have to be made, and who knows how far they can be made without damaging the principle of the Bill. To limit that Minister in the extraordinarily difficult situation which may arise on a controverted Bill to a single opportunity of expressing his views upon each Amendment is really to put him in an impossible position. I would go the length of saying that if you are really going to send controversial Bills up to Grand Committees, and therefore compel them to be fully discussed when they come down on the Report stage, you must make an exception in favour of the Member, be he Minister or be he private individual, who is in charge of the Bill, and allow him to speak twice."

That was the contention of the Leader of the Opposition which had impressed the Prime Minister's mind, and his right hon. friend asked him if there was any objection to meeting that case. The Prime Minister said to him—and he thought that the right hon. Gentleman also said it to the House—that without pledging himself to any particular form of words he accepted that principle. [Cries of "In spirit."] The spirit was expressed in the words which he had quoted, and which the Prime Minister himself had quoted. The House was very jealous of strict faith being kept in such matters; but this was not in the nature of a transaction across the floor of the House. It was a voluntary statement made by the Prime Minister and was in no sense a bargain. What was in the Prime Minister's mind was that when the Report stage was reached on a vital question the Minister in charge was put to a great disadvantage by being allowed to speak only once. This Amendment was calculated to give the Minister or Prime Minister an opportunity of speaking more than once, and the Member who moved the Amendment to speak more than once. He very much regretted the absence of the Prime Minister, who had expected this question to come on much earlier, and he was surprised to hear what had been said about his absence.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yesterday.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said two right hon. Gentlemen opposite had used language which he thought they all knew that the Prime Minister did not deserve. [Some OPPOSITION cries of "No."] The hon. Member said "No," but the House of Commons was proud of the Prime Minister, and "breach of faith" were very ugly words. There must be two parties to a breach of faith, but there was no second party in this case. Although he felt very jealously for the Prime Minister, he believed that there had been a misconception in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and he very much regretted that this discussion had taken place.

MR. LYTTELTON said that, as one who had a profound concern for the dignity and honour of the House and for good fellowship between the two sides of the House, which had considerably increased since the meeting of this Parliament, he wished to put one consideration to right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He and his friends were perfectly ready to accept the explanation which had been given of the intention of the Prime Minister; but the point was not what was the intention of the Prime Minister in his discussions with his colleagues, but what were his words used in the House, what was the impression he conveyed to the House, and what was understood by the House on both sides. The Prime Minister was most unhappily obscure in his expression and statement of his case. It could not be denied that in substance—for he did not wish to quibble about words—the Prime Minister promised that the House should enjoy the same privileges on Report as in Committee. Would any hon. Gentleman say that that was not a plain and reasonable interpretation of his words? He might not have meant it, but he said it.

MR. EVERETT: Most certainly he did not say that.

MR. McKENNA: I say that too; he did not quite say it.

MR. LYTTELTON said that the Minister for Education declared that the Prime Minister did not quite say it, but he said it in as plain words as could be, and it was so accepted by Members universally on that side of the House and by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy. Let him put the matter plainly to hon. Members. It was granted that the Prime Minister should be absolved from any intention to deceive the House in making that statement, and he absolved him from any breach of faith in the matter. But what was the position now, when the Members of the Government present knew in the absence of the Prime Minister that the words which the right hon. Gentleman used in point of fact had the effect of deceiving the Opposition? Knowing that, would they not make themselves guilty of a breach of faith if they persisted in the course of conduct which they were pursuing? A man might say a rash thing which he could not afterwards justify, but after the full consequences of the words used by the Prime Minister had been pointed out, and when not a single Member, even on the other side of the House, could say that it was not a reasonable interpretation which they placed on them, for the Government to insist upon taking advantage of that which the Opposition conceded as the result of the speech was to be guilty of conduct which showed that an attempt was being made to act unreasonably in regard to a statement which did in point of fact deceive Members on that side of the House. According to the best traditions of the House the Government ought not to persist in retaining an advantage so secured.

MR. EVANS said he was very glad that he was not in the House when the Prime Minister made his speech, and therefore he could not indulge in references to what were the Prime Minister's exact words, but he did very much regret that the time of the House had been taken up for an hour or so in bandying across the floor charges and accusations which in private life not one of the speakers would have ventured to make against the Prime Minister. In his opinion the House was not at its best when the Leader of the Opposition in a fierce tone and on an occasion of this kind threw out a charge against the Prime Minister, that he was guilty not of having made a mistake, not of a mistaken apprehension, but of a breach of faith, which charge had been repeated in a much milder tone by the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. The last speaker had indeed said that, not only was the Prime Minister guilty of a breach of faith, but Members on that side were also guilty of a breach of faith in supporting the Government in their present attitude. He was perfectly certain that if the Prime Minister had been there and had got up and said that he did not remember the exact words he used, or that he did not think he used the words which were attributed to him, or that he was not correctly reported, or that they did not convey the impression which was in his mind, the whole of this discussion would have been avoided. His supporters who believed in the Prime Minister and were very much attached to his personality resented these accusations. It was, of course, a great pity that the Prime Minister was not there to meet the allegations which had been made and to explain the passage which had been mentioned. But surely it was enough for the colleagues of the Prime Minister who were in his confidence, and who knew the communications passing between one Minister to another, to get up and say in the House that the Prime Minister never intended to give such a pledge at all. He was quite sure that in private life, or even in the lobby, if a misunderstanding of the kind occurred, the moment it was explained that it was not intended to state what was then contended for, the parties would shake hands and there would be an end of the matter. That was why he was very pleased that he did not hear the speech of the Prime Minister, because it enabled him to bring an open mind to bear on the subject. He was not present when the speech was made, and, like the Leader of the Opposition, he hardly ever opened a newspaper, but he had heard the extract from the report in *The Times* read in the House. *The Times*, of course, was the newspaper which reported the Parliamentary debates best of all among the newspapers, and everyone would admit how marvellously accurate the reports were considering the amount of condensation that the reporters had to carry out. But *The Times* newspaper was not infallible, and from the report of *The Times* it was clear that the Prime Minister by using the phrase "without binding myself to the exact words" of the Amendment said he would meet it in the spirit. That being so he should have thought that what he authorised his colleagues there to state would have been amply sufficient to satisfy hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He would like to turn the current of the discussion from that particular topic which was not decisive of any principle before the House. He regretted that the Leader of the Opposition had been unwilling to grant the Ministerial Bench the same adherence to political principle as that which the right hon. Gentleman himself had formerly claimed, and to stick up for the honour and influence of Parliament in the carrying on of business. He thought that the Amendment went too far, although there was a great deal to be said for the view put forward by the Chancellor of the Duchy. The Amendment not only gave a right of reply to a Minister in charge of a Bill, but it gave a great deal more. It made it possible that every Member should speak as often as he liked. He thought it was undesirable that a Member should be able to speak on the Report stage as often as he could speak in Committee. The tendency of late years had been to move on Report practically every Amendment which was moved in Committee, and the only difference was that Members could speak but once. He thought in the interests of business that to have the debate in Committee repeated on the Report stage, and to give the right of unlimited speech to every Member was undesirable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he could not allow the speech of the hon. Gentleman to pass without comment. The hon. Member had made a personal appeal in regard to the acceptance or not of the word of a Minister of the Crown. No one challenged any statement made either by the Prime Minister or on his authority as to the intentions he meant to convey to the House. But the point was that the right hon. Gentleman did convey something different from the words that were used. The *Hansard* Report—a proof of which he had in his hand—bore out *The Times* report, confirming and corroborating it; and their contention was that if the Prime Minister used the wrong words and created the wrong impression the error should have been corrected on the spot. One of the phrases used was that—

> "The terms of the Amendment might be improved, but the Government were perfectly willing to accept the spirit of the Amendment."

Then the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that it was evident the Report stage would become the Committee stage, so that the misapprehension of the Prime Minister's intention was patent the moment that the right hon. Gentleman sat down. The statement was repeated by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy after the Prime Minister had left the House, but in the presence of the President of the Board of Education. Yet neither the Prime Minister nor the President of the Board of Education took the trouble to correct the prevailing misapprehension. The intentions of Ministers could only be judged by their public statements, and if these public statements gave colour to a false impression they ought to be corrected at the earliest opportunity.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said, with reference to the contention of the President of the Board of Education that it was a rare thing for Members not in charge of a Bill or of an Amendment to speak more than once in Committee on a single question, that he found on referring to a volume of *Hansard* which he had taken at random—that for 4th to 19th November, 1902, and covering only a fortnight of Parliamentary time—that in the debates on the Education Bill of that year recorded in that volume there were three interesting instances of Members of the Party opposite speaking more than once in Committee. Those were the cases of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean (at page 162), the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (at page 434), and the right hon. Gentleman himself, the President of the Board of Education (at page 179).

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LONDON PORT AND DOCKS BILL (BY ORDER).

Second Reading deferred without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 15th April, till Monday 22nd April, at a quarter-past Eight o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PROCEDURE).

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question. "(1) When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to one of the Standing Committees, unless the House, on Motion to be decided without Amendment or debate, otherwise order, and such a Motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately after the Bill is read a second time, may be made by any Member, and may, though opposed, be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business. But this Order shall not apply to (a) Bills for imposing taxes, or Consolidated Fund or Appropriation Bills; or (b) Bills for confirming Provisional Orders. (2) The House may, on Motion made by the Member in charge of a Bill, commit the Bill to a Standing Committee in respect of some of its provisions, and to a Committee of the Whole House in respect of other provisions. If such a Motion is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, a brief explanatory statement from the Member who makes and from the Member who opposes the Motion, shall without further debate put the Question thereon."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Where a Bill has been committed under the foregoing provision of this Standing Order, a Member shall have the same right of speaking on the consideration of the Report of such Committee as if the Bill was before a Committee of the Whole House,'" resumed.

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he was perfectly amazed at the attitude of the Government. Outside the walls of Parliament this matter would have been settled in two minutes by the Minister in charge admitting at once that there had been a misunderstanding and that, of course, the Government would fulfil to the letter whatever they were thought to have pledged themselves to. If the business of the House was conducted on the theory it was professed to be conducted upon, that all hon. Members were honest men and honestly stated their views, Members on the other side of the House were bound to take the view that the Opposition honestly believed the Prime Minister had pledged himself to accept in its sense, if not in the wording, the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Member for the Dublin University. For the Government to stand up and say they were not going to give way in the least was a perfect scandal in Parliamentary life. He did not agree that this was not an important matter; it might not be important in point of time, but it was in the point of view of those who took part in debate. Nobody could say that such an arrangement as that of the Government was fair. Whether they were right or wrong there was a strong feeling on the Opposition Benches that the Government did not adhere very rigidly to their pledges. This was not the first time that they thought the Government had said one thing and done another, but this was the worst case because it was the clearest. Was it not better that the point should be conceded? Was it not a matter of vital importance that there should not be a general impression on the Opposition side of the House that the Government did not treat the Opposition fairly; that they did not stick to their pledges with the rigid and absolute integrity which the House had a right to expect? He ventured to hope that the division would not be taken under that impression. If it was, its effect would be felt for many sessions to come.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said he was present during the remarks made by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy and those made by the Prime Minister, and there could not be the slightest doubt that when the Prime Minister got up, he made a graceful allusion to the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University, and said he wished to make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness. He then said he was prepared to accept the Amendment standing in the right hon. Gentleman's name, and that he was surprised the right hon. Gentleman had made an attack on the Government when he intended to accept the Amendment but without pledging himself to the exact words. The interpretation always placed on such a statement was that the spirit and intention of the Amendment would be accepted. The proof of *Hansard* in the hands of the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer conclusively proved that the impression in their minds to-night was in the Prime Minister's mind. If, therefore, there was a misunderstanding, why did not the Prime Minister get up and correct the false impression that was abroad? Nothing then occurred until, after the intervention of two or three speakers, the Prime Minister left the House, and the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy got up and complained that the Prime Minister had given away his new Rule by accepting the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University. Why then did not the President of the Board of Education get up and contradict that?

Mr. McKENNA: It would have been out of order.

Sir F. BANBURY: The right hon. Gentleman could have put up somebody else to do so.

Mr. McKENNA: The whole discussion was out of order.

Sir F. BANBURY said that that was a matter for Mr. Speaker to decide, but many times in his experience hon. and right hon. Gentlemen had contravened the rules in order to correct a misapprehension. When he later on went into the lobby, and the right hon. Member for Dublin University was congratulating himself in having got his Amendment accepted, he expressed the opinion to his right hon. friend that the hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs had put a spoke in his wheel; that the Government, having now found that they had made a mistake, would go back on their word. If the Government would only admit that they had made a mistake, they would at least show that they had the courage of their convictions; but they had refused to do that, and tried to make out that they meant something entirely different.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said that, having heard what was stated in the debate yesterday, he desired to confirm the observations made by the hon. Member for the City of London. It seemed to him that, if there was no Amendment of the nature of that which was now before the House, or none such as had been suggested in the name of the Prime Minister, which, he presumed, was initiated to carry out the pledge that they understood had been given to them, it was clear that upon Report there would be the same proceedings as took place now. If it was desired, in consideration of the Committee Stage having been sent upstairs, to give some extra privileges to Members upon Report, it was a most astonishing way of giving those extra privileges simply to give them to the Government and the mover of the Motion. It was taking away a constitutional privilege from every Member of the House. It was not at present possible for the Government, any more than a private Member, to speak twice on a Motion or Amendment on Report. But to give that additional voice and right to speak to the Government of the day was to his mind, instead of making a concession to Members of the House, doing exactly the opposite, and placing them in a worse position than they would otherwise occupy. He was one of those who felt exceedingly the way in which they had been treated. There was not the slightest doubt that they had all been led to believe that the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin was going to be accepted. They were distinctly told so twice by the Prime Minister; they all thought so; the Member for Kirkcaldy thought so. Now they learned that the Amendment was not only not going to be accepted, but that they were actually going to be placed in a worse position upon Report than they would be in if there was no Amendment at all. He thought it was rather a shocking state of affairs, and one which called for protest on the part of any Member who felt that statements, offers, or pledges given in the House ought to be carried out to the letter.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 83; Noes, 290. (Division List No. 124.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.HnHugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn. J.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir JohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.Col.W.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Long,Rt. Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, Jn. Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richards
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir W. J. (S.Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. N.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.

Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H.Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (RoscommonN
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Redmond,JohnE.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheey, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,ThomasF.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendall)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(SomersetE
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walsh. Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Tren t
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White,Patrick(Meath,North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry(Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth)

Wilson, J.H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth), in moving an Amendment to the effect that the Rule should not apply to Bills referred to in the Speech from the Throne at the commencement of the session, said the great distinction between this and other proposals to except Bills from the Rule was that it got rid of the difficulty, which was bound to arise in every case, of ascertaining what the nature of the Bills was. The Amendment made the matter perfectly clear, and there could be no dispute, when it came to a particular Bill, as to whether it was to remain in the House or be sent upstairs. The Government proposed to except Money Bills and Bills of a highly contentious character and the most important Bills in the Government programme. But it would always be open to the Government to say of a particular Bill that it was not of a contentious character, and the Opposition would feel that the Rule was not being fairly interpreted. A Government generally tried to put its best foot forward, and placed in its programme at the commencement of the session those Bills which it claimed to have obtained a mandate from the country to pass into law. If those important measures were exempted from the Rule they would know exactly what business they had before them to discuss during the session. If his Amendment were accepted, the Government would not be able to send important Bills upstairs in order to burke discussion. He begged to move.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Bills referred to in His Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne at the commencement of the session."—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. MCKENNA said the hon. Member was mistaken in his understanding of the proposed Rule, because there could not be any acrimonious discussions of the nature to which he had alluded. It would be impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment. He pointed out that this year, in the Speech from the Throne, such Bills as those for the establishment of a Court of criminal appeal, the regulation of hours in mines, the Amendment of the patent laws, and the improvement of the law relating to the valuation of property were mentioned, all of which were very proper Bills to be sent to a Grand Committee. The Amendment would prevent their being sent upstairs.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said the right hon. Gentleman had dismissed the Amendment in a somewhat cursory manner. He thought there was a good deal in the suggestion that at the beginning of the session Members should know what Bills were to be discussed on the floor of the House, and what Bills were to be sent upstairs. The Bills contained in the King's Speech might be divided into two classes, and classified as Bills of first-class and second-class importance. The danger, he foresaw, was that a Government overburdened with a programme of legislation which it attempted to drive through by sledge-hammer methods, might find as the session progressed that it would be impossible to complete its programme if all the measures of first-class importance were to be discussed on the floor of the House. To any Government in that position there would be a strong temptation to send up to a Grand Committee measures, even of first-class importance, which, according to the general practice, ought to be discussed upon the floor of the House. That danger could be obviated by the acceptance of some such Amendment as this. The Prime Minister had said over and over again that it was not intended to send measures of primary importance upstairs, and the House wanted to know what he meant by that.

MR. MCKENNA asked if the noble Lord could quote the Prime Minister's words.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY said he had not with him the quotation, but he would appeal to the recollection of the House as to whether what he had roughly stated was what the Prime Minister had said. He understood that the Prime Minister's words were "the important controversial measures of the session." He thought that expression of opinion by the Prime Minister ought to be embodied in the Standing Order. There was a very real danger that unless something of the kind were done measures which ought to be discussed in Committee of the Whole House would be sent upstairs, merely because the Government found themselves in a difficulty. He hoped they would have a more satisfactory reply from the Government on this point.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 76; Noes, 279. (Division List No. 125.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh. Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lan'rk, Govan
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, Frederick John Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes.—Mr. Fell and Mr. Remnant.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Ediwn A.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)

Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enock (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George

Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)

Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somers't, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, at the beginning, to insert the words 'Provided that.'"—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said sub-section (2) of the Resolution which was now before the House proposed in certain cases to divide Bills into two parts, one part being reserved for the consideration of the whole House in Committee, and the other part sent upstairs for the consideration of a Standing Committee. As a Member of the Procedure Committee he knew that this was introduced last year in rather a curious way. It did not form part of the scheme of the Government as originally submitted to the Committee, but was suddenly, at a later stage of their proceedings, brought forward by the Chairman. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London, when examined as a witness, was asked some questions with respect to this Rule which did not appear on the Paper, and it was then announced that the Government had adopted the Rule which was practically the same as that now proposed as sub-section (2) of the Resolution. He thought there could be little doubt as to the genesis of that particular rule. It was brought forward at the time the Education Bill was about to be discussed in the House, and no doubt the Government intended to press forward the new Rules in order that they might be able to divide that Bill into two parts, and to retain the controversial clauses for consideration of the Committee of the Whole House, while the machinery part was sent upstairs to be dealt with by a Standing Committee. Whether or not it was the intention of the Government at that time to apply the Rule to the Education Bill, it was clear from the discussions that there was to be a rather new application of the proposal. A few nights ago the Government had stated what in their opinion the application of the sub-section should be in reference to a very important Bill of this session, namely, the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill. The Government had indicated that the whole of that Bill could, under the sub-section, be sent upstairs, with the exception of one half-section of one clause dealing with finance, which would be left to be considered by Committee of the Whole House. He could hardly imagine a more objectionable application of the sub-section, or one less likely to lead to advantageous discussion either in the House or in the Standing Committee. The House always heard two voices from the Government in regard to the construction of the new Rules. A few minutes ago the right hon. Gentleman had given his rendering, and shortly afterwards he had been entirely contradicted by the Chancellor of the Duchy as to the kind of Bills that were to be retained entirely in the House. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it was only small questions of finance or procedure that were to be sent upstairs for discussion, and that all other questions were to be kept downstairs. The Amendment he himself had moved in Committee in connection with this question was accepted at the time; but it formed no part of the plan of the Government. His suggestion was that if a Bill was to be divided they should insist on the principle of the Bill being established in the Whole House, only that portion connected with the machinery of the Bill being sent upstairs. In the Standing Order as now presented there was no suggestion of that kind—what portion of the Bill should be sent upstairs, and what portion should be retained. The only opportunity the House would be given for any explanation or debate on the Report stage would be an extremely short statement by the Minister in charge, or by the Member who opposed. Unlimited as the Government proposal was, he considered it a dangerous innovation, unlikely to facilitate business, or to lead to the good drafting of the Bills. It was, therefore, with regret that he suggested to leave out the words "provided that," in order eventually to leave out the whole sub-section.

MR. MCKENNA said that the addition of the two words, "provided that," was merely a drafting Amendment, and that they had been inserted to satisfy a suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. As to the substantial question raised by the hon. Gentleman on the merits of the second part of the Rule, all they asked was to give the House the power of dividing a Bill, sending the less controversial portions upstairs, and retaining the highly controversial portions in the House. The hon. Gentleman had said that the power to divide the Bill was a great encroachment on the privileges of the House, but he agreed that it would expedite the machinery parts of the Bill if they were sent upstairs to be considered by the Committee. The House had already decided that all Bills might go upstairs with the exception of those stated in the Rule.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY: What Bills?

MR. McKENNA: All Bills with the exception of finance Bills. It was surely not unwise that the House should have the power to retain parts of Bills, and not be obliged to send the whole upstairs.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that these Rules were landing the House in greater and greater confusion. It had been understood that all Bills were automatically to go upstairs with the exception of Bills imposing taxes, or dealing with finance; but now they were told that the Government would say how much of a Bill should be sent upstairs, and how much should be retained in the House. The Opposition had asked that all Bills involving great national and imperial considerations should be retained, but the Government had continually refused that. Now they were told that the Government were going to reserve certain portions of Bills to be retained, or to be sent upstairs. So far as at present appeared, it was proposed to give the Government of the day a perfectly arbitrary power to decide how much of a Bill was to be sent upstairs, and how much of it was to be kept in the House. He regarded the proposal as depriving the House of the opportunity of looking at a Bill as a whole, and as likely to land the business of the House in great confusion.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that the hon. Member constantly referred to the Government, whereas it was the House of Commons which decided the matter. All the authorities on procedure were agreed that the details and machinery parts of a Bill could be better settled in Committee upstairs, while those dealing with matters of principle should be retained for discussion in Committee of the Whole House. He maintained that of all the proposals there were none more important for carrying out efficiently the business of the House.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not consider the Amendment which he had on the Paper, to provide that the Standing Committee should not proceed with the consideration of that portion of the Bill committed to it until the other portion had passed through Committee of the Whole House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER said that the Amendment to which the hon. Gentleman was referring was a separate Amendment, and he could not allow it to be discussed at that point.

MR. FORSTER said he did not wish to discuss the Amendment; he was only asking whether the right hon. Gentleman would make some Amendment of the Standing Order in the direction he had suggested. The matter was discussed before the Procedure Committee, and he thought they were all agreed that if parts of Bills were to be reserved for consideration in Committee of the Whole House those portions of the Bills would necessarily contain the proposals which were vital to the Bill. He thought, therefore, it would be waste of time if the Standing Committee were to be occupied in discussing machinery which might be rendered useless by the discussions in Committee of the Whole House. He did not wish to labour the point in view of the ruling of Mr. Deputy Speaker, but he hoped the Government would see their way to amend their proposals in that sense. He would like to make one other suggestion. An Amendment might be made in Committee of the Whole House which was inconsistent with an Amendment made in the Committee upstairs. He thought it would be some guide to the Committee upstairs if they had before them the result of the deliberations in Committee of the Whole House. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would tell them that an amendment would be proposed to meet these difficulties.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said the matter had been considered, but he believed that when the experts and the officials came to deal with the question the Government were advised that it would be better to leave the matter as it now stood, and that if the hon. Member's Amendment were accepted it would complicate matters much more than if things were left in their present state.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said they were obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for referring to this matter again, but he pointed out that if the machinery clauses of a Bill came before a Grand Committee, and the operative clauses before a Committee of the Whole House, it was not only probable, but inevitable, that the Committee dealing with the machinery clauses would insert provisions and make alterations inconsistent with the main principle underlying the Bill. He thought that was a fair case for consideration, because unless the same Committee dealt with the whole of a Bill they were bound to get it considered from various points of view, with the result that one-half of the Bill would be dealt with from one point of view, and the other half considered in another aspect. For himself he did not think that the machinery clauses of a Bill could be detached or divorced from the parts containing the root principle. The principle of the Bill and its machinery ought to be unified, and it was an exceedingly unbusiness-like proceeding to say that certain clauses could be considered before one Committee, and that others which had to carry out the object expressed in those clauses might be considered by a different Committee. He hoped the Government and the House would reconsider the question, because he felt convinced that if they did not, Bills which came down to the House under the new condition of things would not be satisfactory or coherent.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said it seemed to him that the proposal of the Government in this particular was open to the objection which they had taken to their suggestions on former occasions, namely, that it displayed extreme vagueness. The language of which they were asked to approve was most general in its character. It contained no definition and no direction. All they had to go upon on this occasion, as on many others, was a declaration by the Government of their intention and their view, but when Members on that side of the House desired to have those declarations enshrined in a clause they were always met with a mere negation. He believed a proposal framed as this one was, was unworkable, and that it would cause great embarrassment and must end in failure. He was grateful to the House for allowing him to speak at so late a stage of the proceedings, and it was a privilege to do so. But he felt very strongly that it was on the successful or unsuccessful working of these proposals that the excellence or otherwise of their future legislation must depend. This was not a Party, but a national question, upon which the whole working of the machinery of the House of Commons depended.

Question put, and agreed to.

SIR F. BANBURY moved an Amendment to limit the operation of the new Rules to the end of the Session of 1908. He said that his object was to ensure that the new Rules should practically be only sessional rules. He had a precedent for that proposal. Whether the Rules were good or bad they would bring about a great revolution in the course of business and the procedure of the House. That was admitted by the Prime Minister himself because the right hon. Gentleman described the changes as being of a revolutionary character, and justified them simply and solely by saying that in his opinion they would facilitate business. He thought the House would act wisely if they accepted his Amendment, so that if the Rules did not turn out to be a success the House would have authority to terminate them. On the other hand, if the Rules were successful they could be re-enacted. He had a precedent for his Amendment, and that was the action of Mr. Gladstone in 1882, when he established the two Grand Committees to which they were now going to add two more. Mr. Gladstone gave many good reasons to show there was considerable danger in connection with the new Committees. One reason he gave for establishing them was that they would transact business that interested only a part of the House, and he stated that that business, and that business only, should go before them. Mr. Gladstone was most anxious that the business that had an interest for the whole of the House should remain in the floor of the House. That was quite different from the desire of the Prime Minister. Mr. Gladstone desired to set up the Committees as an experiment only. The very fears which they in opposition now had were those which Mr. Gladstone felt in 1882 in connection with a much milder alteration of the Rules of the House. While the Prime Minister was absent from the House the President of the Board of Education had told them that highly controversial Bills would not be sent upstairs. But the right hon. Gentleman also gave the House to understand that the only judge of what was a controversial Bill would be the Government of the day. He indicated that all Bills under these Rules, with the exception of money Bills, would be sent to the Committee, and that though the Government could send up highly controversial Bills, it would be in their power to keep them in the House. Therefore, the only safeguard the House had against highly controversial Bills being sent upstairs would be the Government of the day. He had every confidence in the present Government in so far that he believed they would pledge themselves not to remit such Bills to a Committee, but that was no safeguard against a future Government. In this connection he would like to quote some words which the present Prime Minister used from the Opposition Front Bench on 6th February, 1902. The right hon. Gentleman then said—

> "After all there is an old phrase which may sound a mere artificial form of words that this House is the grand inquest of the Nation. But really that does express the foundation truth of the duty of the House. This is no mere factory establishment; it is not a mere counting house in which demands on the public purse are to be checked and approved and provided for. It is something much more and much more important. For my part I will go as far as to say that the function of the conduct of business is merely secondary to the maintenance of those rights of which I speak. It would be better that this House should be less efficient in its transaction of business and should retain the full faculty of exercising the functions to which I refer than that should be diminished and that the House should become the most perfect legislative machine in the world."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Hear, hear.

SIR F. BANBURY expressed surprise that the right hon. Gentleman should cheer that quotation unless he proposed to accept the Amendment, because the Amendment intended to provide exactly the state of things contemplated by the words he had just read; that was to say, to provide that the control of the House should remain in the House even at the sacrifice of what the right hon. Gentleman believed these Committees were going to do, namely, facilitate legislation. He begged to move.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) seconded the Amendment for the reason that the Prime Minister had himself stated earlier in the debate that the very great change he proposed to make was of a highly experimental nature. If that was so, the right hon. Gentleman should treat it as an experiment and allow the House at the end of a couple of years to have an opportunity of either re-enacting the Rules or allowing them to lapse.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 11, after the word 'House,' to insert the words 'until the end of the Session of 1908.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he could not accept the Amendment. He thought he could not do anything more likely to defeat the object they had in view than to put a limit to the operation of the Rules.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided: Ayes 117; Noes, 361. (Div. List No. 126.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart

Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Mennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn. Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith,Aber H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets.S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt.HnSirJ.T(Cheshire
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannermann, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo;
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar,Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder,Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)

Edwards, Eoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
GladstoneRt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Geoffrey
Howard, Hon. Geoffery
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir JosephF. (Accrington)
Lehmann,;R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeagh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Don. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'd
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton,;David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)

Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn (C'rmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

And, it being after Ten of the Clock, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 15th April, proceeded to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments and Motions moved by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendments—

"In line 13, after the word 'provisions,' to insert the words 'and that;'

"In line 17, at the end, to add the words, '(3) Where a Bill has been committed to a Standing Committee, or has been so committed in respect of any provision, then, at the Report stage of the Bill or provision, the rule against speaking more than once shall not apply to the Member in charge of the Bill or to the mover of any Amendment or new Clause in respect of that Amendment or Clause'"—made.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 359; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 127.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone.N)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHn SirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Coats, Sir T.Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey

Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, RtHn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R, C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembr'ke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen

Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway

Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, RtHnA. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George

Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F (Bury S. Edm'ds.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildway, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Motion made, and Question put, "That this Order be a Standing Order of the House."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 350; Noes, 122. (Division List No. 128.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir

Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John

Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ H.(Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Ches'ire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W.Howell (Bristol,S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder,SirJohn P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn,A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick. Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R.L(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert,T.Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Lever,W.H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)

Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H (Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,JohnHenry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester)
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm'gham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, A.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn. Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin.S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.

Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Standing Order 46 read as follows:—The Resolutions of the House of the 1st December, 1882, relating to the constitution and proceedings of Standing Committees for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, and to Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, shall be revived, and Trade shall include Agriculture and Fishing.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Standing Order be repealed."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 387; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 129.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle ofWight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hiirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H(Essex,Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J. F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Rt.Hn.SirJT.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.HnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, SirT.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J(S.Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford,S.
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius

Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W.(Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, JWynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(WMonm'th)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whiechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.HnSir Alex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie,H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (MaryleboneE.,)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'd)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav. Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Claude Hay and Sir William Bull.

Standing Order 47 read as follows :—Two Standing Committees shall be appointed for the consideration of all Bills relating to Law and Courts of Justice and Legal Procedure, and to Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, which may by Order of the House in each case, be committed to them ; and the procedure in such Committees shall be the same as in a Select Committee, unless the House shall otherwise order : provided, that strangers shall be admitted, except when the Committee shall order them to withdraw ; and the said Committees shall not sit, after Three of the Clock, whilst the House is sitting, without the Order of the House : provided also, that any notice of Amendment to any clause in a Bill which may be committed to a Standing Committee, given by any hon. Member in the House, shall stand referred to such Committee : provided also, that Twenty be the quorum of such Standing Committees.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the word 'Two' and insert the word 'Four.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That the word 'Two' stand part of the Standing Order."

The House divided:—Ayes, 121; Noes, 350. (Division List, No. 130.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'hgam)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Farncis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'm'rs't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Dev'np'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J. T. (Ches.)
Bryce, J. Annan

Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Maj. E. Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, E. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Moleno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Atherstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter

Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, John Henry (Halifax
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Herny J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Question put, "That the word 'Four' be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 336; Noes, 121. (Division List, No. 131.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'mers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp't
Benn, W.(T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J.H.(Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt.Hn. Sir J.T. (Ches.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Polard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J.(S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Rdwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh

Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart,-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C.B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Satfford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Monrgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax).
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, Robt. John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashtonunder Lyne
Sears, .J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H.J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S,)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander

Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarth’n
Williams, Osmond (Merion’th)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,.RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt.Hn.G.(Winchest’r
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon, Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Coates, E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh’m
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple,.Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm’ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.CharlesW (Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
O’Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out from the word 'Bills' to the word 'committed' in line 4'"—made.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In line 7, to leave out the words 'after Three of the Clock.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Standing Order."

The House divided:—Ayes, 119; Noes, 385. (Division List No. 132.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred.Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law. Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.Chas. W. (Evesh'm)
Long, Rt. Hn.Walter(Dublin,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley GeorgeD.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(Tw'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, Rt.HnSirJ.T.Chesh.)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt,Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery C.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Maj.E. Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)

Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(DerbyshireN.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J,
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond,John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F. (Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J,
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowdon, P.

Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In line 8, after the word 'sitting,' to insert the words 'except in pursuance of a Resolution of the Committee, moved by the Member in charge of the Bill before the Committee, and decided without Amendment or debate, and shall not sit after four p.m.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 374; Noes, 118. (Division List, No. 133.)

AYES.

Abraham,William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Rt Hn SirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir W.J.(S.Pancras,W.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St. Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.

Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford. S.
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schawnn, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)

Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W,
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward,W. Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt. HnJ.A.(Worc.
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingham
Corbett, A Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill,Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Farem
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meyesy-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G.(Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Michell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson.A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Claude Hay and Sir William Bull.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In line 12, at the end, to add the words 'One of the Standing Committees shall be appointed for the consideration of all Public Bills relating exclusively to Scotland and committed to a Standing Committee, and shall consist of all the Members representing Scottish constituencies, together with not more than fifteen other Members to be nominated in respect of any Bill by the Committee of Selection, who shall have regard in such nomination to the approximation of the balance of Parties in the Committee to that in the Whole House, and shall have power from time to time to discharge, for non-attendance or at their own request, the Members so nominated by them, and to appoint others in substitution for those discharged. Subject as aforesaid the Bills committed to a Standing Committee shall be distributed among the Committees by Mr. Speaker. In all but one of the Standing Committees Government Bills shall have precedence. Standing Order 19 (as to irrelevance and repetition) and Standing Orders 26 and 27 (as to closure) shall apply to Standing Committees, with the substitution in Standing Order 26 of the Chairman of the Committee for the Chairman of Ways and Means, and, in Standing Order 27 of 20 for 100 as the number necessary to render the majority effective for the Closure, and the Chairman of a Standing Committee shall have the like powers as the Chairman of a Committee of the Whole House has under Standing Order 23 (as to dilatory motions).' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House divided:—Ayes, 363; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 134.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H.(Essex, Romford
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm J.(St Pancras, W)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, C H(Sussex, E. Grinsted)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis

Hardy, George A (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down, S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Killop, W.

M‘Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G. Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton
Philipps,J. Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Prestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F, (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbghs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd

Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austen (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley(Southamptn)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hn.AJ (CityLond.)
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt. HnG(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Coates,E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt. Hn.J.(Birminghm
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hon.Col.W
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt. Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R,
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt. HnWalter(Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G.(Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Standing Order 48 read as follows:—Each of the said Standing Committees shall consist of not less than sixty nor more than eighty Members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection, who shall have regard to the classes of Bills committed to such Committees, to the composition of the House, and to the qualifications of the Members selected; and shall have power to discharge Members from time to time, and to appoint others in substitution for those discharged. The Committee of Selection shall also have power to add not more than fifteen Members to a Standing Committee in respect of any Bill referred to it, to serve on the Committee during the consideration of such Bill.

Amendment—

"In line 6, after the word 'time,' to insert 'for non-attendance or at their own request'"—made.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, after the word 'discharged,' to insert the words, 'provided that, for the consideration of all Public Bills relating exclusively to Wales and Monmouthshire, the Committee shall be so constituted as to comprise all Members sitting for constituencies in Wales and Monmouthshire.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 351; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 135.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwich, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James

Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Newnes, F. (Notts. Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,RobertJohn (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendal, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H.(Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford
Samuel,HerbertL. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland. J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds,S.)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt Henry A.
Wedgwood Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell O.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks

Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon.Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Caber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS. Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,RtHn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David(Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James L. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut-Col.Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith,AbelH. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomas,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E. Howard
Walker,Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment—

"At end, to add 'Provided that this Order shall not apply to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.'"—made.

Standing Order 49 read as follows:—

The Committee of Selection shall nominate a Chairmen's Panel to consist of not less than four nor more than six Members, of whom three shall be a quorum; and the Chairmen's Panel shall appoint from among themselves the Chairman of each Standing Committee, and may change the Chairman so appointed from time to time.

Amendment—

"To leave out 'six' and insert 'eight.'"—made.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday evening, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 17*th April*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Llandrindod Wells Gas; Bude Gas; Falmouth Gas; Annfield Plain and District Gas; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions); Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited [H.L.];

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.] Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next.

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Read 2ª (according to order).

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Order of the Day for the Second Reading read, and discharged.

Tyne Improvement Bill [H.L.]; Read 3ª. An Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Oxford and District Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Read 3ª and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; The Order made on the 18th of March last, appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged.

Glasgow Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [H.L]; Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Clinton be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Faber; read, and agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [H.L.] A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the London County Council to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts. Was presented by the Lord President (*E. Crewe*); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 31.)

LONDON GOVERNMENT SCHEME (SOUTHWARK BOROUGH MARKET) BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*The LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (The Earl of Crewe): My Lords, this Bill is one which arises out of the London Government Act of 1899, and relates to the Borough Market of Southwark, which was originally founded under an old Act passed in the year 1764 in the reign of George III. By that Act the wardens of the parish of St. Saviour, the overseers of that parish, and eleven elected inhabitant ratepayers were constituted trustees for the purpose of this market. To make a long story short, owing to various changes in local government, for instance the fact that overseers are no longer appointed and that their powers are vested in the borough council, and also owing to some doubts which have arisen as to the possibility of electing the eleven inhabitant ratepayers since the Act of 1899, it has been found necessary to form a new scheme for this purpose. The effect of this Bill is that the trustees are in future to be appointed by the borough council on the nomination of the councillors of the ward, which is co-extensive with the parish of St. Saviour. At first there was some opposition to this Bill both from the London County Council and from the borough council of Southwark, but I am glad to say that the objections have been entirely withdrawn and that the Bill passed through another place without opposition. If your Lordships will give it a Second Reading it will then go, in accordance with the new, and, as I think, very valuable Standing Order, to the Committee on Unopposed Bills, where it will receive due consideration. I hope in these circumstances your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª. —(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, Bill read **2ª** (according to order) and committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT, No. 2. (1907.)

Despatch from the Earl of Cromer respecting the water supply of Egypt.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3763. France: (Trade and agriculture of French West Africa for 1905–1906);

No. 3764. France: (Réunion);

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

University Court Ordinance, No. XIX. (Glasgow No. 5). Foundation of James S. Dixon Chair of Mining: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 29.)

CROFTING PARISHES (SCOTLAND).

Return respecting: Laid before the House (pursuant to order of the 18th of March last), and to be printed. (No. 30.)

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Lord Balfour appointed to take the chair in Committees of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH rose to move that there be laid before this House a complete list, with dates of issue, of the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and of the appendices thereto; together with an alphabetical index of the collections examined and reported on, giving a reference to the Report and appendix wherein the result of the examination may be found.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the Motion which stands in my name will, I believe, be accepted by the noble Earl who represents the Home Office. It requires no explanation, because it is a Motion which has to be made from time to time to secure a continuance of this index. I have been in communication with the representatives of the Home Office, and I understand they are willing that the House should pass this Motion. In moving it I venture to make two suggestions which I hope the noble Earl will be able to accept—namely, that some of the volumes which have been already printed, but are out of print, should be incorporated with the Return now asked for, and that the Return when printed should be on quarto paper, the same size paper as the volumes of which it is the index.

Moved, That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for a complete list, with dates of issue, of the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and of the appendices thereto; together with an alphabetical index of the collections examined and reported on, giving a reference to the Report and appendix wherein the result of the examination may be found.—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, His Majesty's Government are quite ready to give the Return asked for by the noble Lord. With regard to the special points to which he has referred, there are, I know, some Members of the Commission who are in favour of what he has suggested, and I have very little doubt that, with their support, the Commission will give effect to his request.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

THE SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.

LORD BRASSEY rose to call attention to the programme of shipbuilding for the Navy as proposed for 1907–1908. The noble Lord said: My Lords, before dealing with shipbuilding, I may offer one observation with which my noble friend will certainly agree. He will admit that he is not unduly troubled with interpellations from these benches. Noble Lords in opposition are patriotic. They are silent because they are satisfied with the general administration of the Navy. The supporters of the Government know that the strength of the Navy in men and ships is being adequately maintained. Where economy has been possible Votes have been cut down. No pains have been spared to perfect the training of the Navy. The manœuvres recently carried out have been on a scale unprecedented in time of peace. The advance in gunnery has been notable, reflecting credit both on the gunnery officers of the Fleet and the seamen. Better provision has been made for the instruction of officers in naval strategy, in navigation, and in other subjects. The education of cadets has been revised and adapted to modern requirements.

The country has confidence, and rightly so, in the general administration of the Navy. There are always points on which suggestions may be offered. Briefly, I propose to deal with shipbuilding. The relative strength of Navies depends essentially on battleships. Looking back over a long term of years, our battleships, whether constructed by Sir Nathaniel Barnaby, Sir William White, or Sir Philip Watts, have been always equal, and often superior, to the ships of even date laid down for other Powers. Our latest battleships are those of the "Dreadnought" type. They show a great advance in armament and speed, and also in size and cost. The building of the "Dreadnought" type is commended by an overwhelming weight of authority—by the naval advisers and the technical advisers of the Admiralty, and by a Report obtained from a strong independent committee of naval officers, shipbuilders and men of science. There is testimony perhaps even more conclusive. Ships of the "Dreadnought" type are being laid down by nearly every maritime Power—by Russia and Japan, by France and the United States. We have been the first to lay them down and have stolen a march.

There must always be need for some ships of less dimensions than the "Dreadnought." The cost of the "Dreadnought" may be put in round figures at £2,000,000. Such ships must be few. And there are operations of war which can be more effectively performed by many ships than by few. The forces with which a superior fleet may have to deal may be widely scattered. There are the tactical considerations on which Admiral Sir Reginald Custance has insisted—

> "No ship" (he contends), "however large, can stand up against the fire of two or three battleships."

There are the many risks from which size will not secure immunity. There is the risk of instantaneous destruction by the submarine mine, fatal to both sides in the war in the Far East. There are the risks of navigation. Casualties have been numerous in the British Navy. We have lately lost a battleship. It would not be well to build ships for the British Navy inferior as to calibre of guns, armour, speed or endurance. We may adopt the suggestion put forward by Sir William White. We may lay down a type in which the armament of two "Dreadnoughts" may be distributed between three vessels, equal in speed, armament and defence, and possibly superior in fighting power to the larger ships.

If it is difficult to produce a type of battleship which shall be in all respects satisfactory, the difficulty is greater still in the case of cruisers. In the endeavour to combine offensive and defensive power, speed and endurance, our latest cruisers have become as large and costly as battleships. It has been contended that as armoured cruisers come nearer to battleships in armour and armament, it will be difficult to limit their sphere of action to that strictly belonging to cruisers. In the line of battle their speed would give no advantage, while in fighting power they would be inferior to the battleships to which they were opposed. It seems clear that the Admiralty should concentrate their resources as far as possible on battleships. By adopting this policy the fleet of Germany has been created with estimates relatively moderate in amount. Our cruisers must be sufficient to meet those of other Powers. There has been no neglect in this respect on the part of the Admiralty. As against armoured vessels, the protected cruisers must be reckoned as non-combatants. They are necessary to protect commerce. The British Navy has, in this class, an overwhelming superiority.

Vessels are necessary for scouting duties. They are the eyes of the fleet. Eight scouts have lately been built. They are costly, but not satisfactory, flimsy in construction, weak in armour and armament. Speed is the only merit. The scouts are too small for ocean service. No more vessels of this class are being laid down. A new and enlarged destroyer, the "Swift," has, however, been proposed. The estimated cost is £250,000, or nearly that of the scouts. The building of ships of this class is, I submit, open to question. In fine weather their speed will only slightly exceed that of the ocean destroyers now building; and the estimated cost of a destroyer is half that of the "Swift."

In view of the failure of the ablest constructors, both in the Admiralty and out of doors, to produce an effective cruiser for scouting duties, the policy of subventions to mail steamers merits attention. After the close of the War of Secession the policy of subsidies to auxiliary cruisers was strongly advocated by the Secretary for the United States Navy. It was recommended later by Sir Nathaniel Barnaby, and approved by the highest naval authorities of the day—by Sir Spencer Robinson, Controller; and Sir Frederick Grey, First Sea Lord of the Admiralty. Similar proposals were renewed by Sir Donald Currie, and again approved by the naval advisers of the Admiralty—by Sir Cooper Key and Sir Anthony Hawkins.

The latest testimony to the value of the ocean greyhounds as auxiliaries to the Navy is that of Lord Charles Beresford, who appeared as a witness before the Committee on Subsidies. He urged that a reserve of auxiliaries to the Navy should be formed by the enrolment of subsidised mail steamers in our Admiralty list. The auxiliaries would be used to keep open long lines of communication. It is not necessary that all the ships on the Admiralty list should have the speed of the two vessels now completing for the Cunard Company. Extreme speed is most costly. At a comparatively moderate cost we may secure auxiliaries with more enduring speed than has ever yet been attained in vessels of war, encumbered as they must be with the weight of armour and armament. The policy recommended by Lord Charles Beresford has been adopted by all foreign Governments, by France, Germany, Italy, and the United States. It has lately been advocated by President Roosevelt. The British Navy is ill-supplied with auxiliaries.

The mercantile auxiliary offers a twofold advantage. In peace it can be usefully employed. Swift communications are bonds of Empire. We are at this time seeking with one heart to make those bonds, by every practicable means, closer. Action must depend on opportunity. New services have recently been established between Canada and the mother country. Others are being proposed. A liberal policy on the part of the Home Government in giving aid to such undertakings would be wise. It should lead to economy by removing the necessity for laying down special vessels as scouts. It would strengthen the Navy; it would promote the unity of the Empire.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, there is one remark I should like to make arising out of what has fallen from the noble Lord opposite on the subject of scouts. The whole practice of scouting has been altered by the invention of wireless telegraphy, and is now being worked out and studied on a totally different basis from what it was ten years ago. There is also the question of submarine bells which come in as a secondary method of communication with ships at sea. In consequence of this ships will not now require a large chain of scouts consisting of many vessels more or less in sight of one another, but considerably fewer vessels using wireless telegraphy. The demand, therefore, for scouting cruisers is less than it was ten or fifteen years ago. As regards the construction of smaller battleships, there is one point against putting the armament of two "Dreadnoughts" into three vessels, and it is that as your line will be longer you will not have your power concentrated so well.

Questions have arisen about the reduction of the Cawdor programme, and I think myself that that reduction was a mistake, not because the preponderance of the British Navy has actually been impaired by that reduction, but because it was a financial mistake. I was in Germany last autumn. The comments of the Germans sounded like a pæan of victory. England was showing signs of giving up the struggle. The feeling there, in view of that reduction, resembled very much the feeling of a jockey who, knowing that his own horse has plenty of running left in him, sees the only horse in front of him swerving across the course and faltering in his stride. He is thereby encouraged to fresh efforts. We have encouraged Germany in this respect to fresh efforts, and we shall have to meet them with corresponding exertions on our own part. I am afraid that, for every £100,000 we have saved this year we may have to spend £1,000,000 afterwards.

Though foreign programmes are important, what is actually being done in foreign dockyards is still more important. As far as I have been able to ascertain, the Admiralty of late years have been very watchful on this subject. A modern battleship requires so many persons to construct it that it is impossible to build it with any degree of speed without its being generally known. This does not apply to submarines and torpedo boats. The theory that Great Britain can build battleships so much faster than Germany, that we can let them have a start and then catch them up whenever we choose, is not at all accepted in German shipbuilding circles. They know all that we did when we built the "Dreadnought" so well and so quickly, and they think they could improve upon our methods, and build at least as fast if they felt themselves compelled to do so. At least six German firms undertake to build battleships, and between them they say they could put twelve battleships on the stocks every year; in addition to that there are the Imperial yards at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven.

Again, our method of voting Estimates is, to my mind, rather antiquated and unbusinesslike, as it exposes the country to a certain amount of risk if, when Parliament is not sitting, foreign countries start shipbuilding programmes. In that case they get a start of us. I think this might be remedied if the First Lord of the Admiralty had power, when any exceptional activity was noticed in foreign dockyards, to lay down fresh ships at once without waiting for Parliament to pass the Votes. A still better plan would be for both Houses of Parliament to pass Resolutions requesting the First Lord to do so. I think such a Resolution might be moved from one Front Bench and seconded from the other. It would not cost the country money in the long run, and it would lessen any risks to which we might be exposed. I venture to think that such a policy would be far better than waiting to pass Estimates on or about the 1st April, when they might be too late to achieve their object. I also think it would do more to check the activity of foreign countries in this direction than paper resolutions passed at the Hague and elsewhere.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, my noble friend who initiated this discussion has had a long experience of the Navy and of ships generally, and always speaks with great authority in this House. I was very much pleased to hear from him that he approves of what the Admiralty have done up to the present time. He approved of our shipbuilding programme, although he made certain suggestions by which it might be supplemented. Before I go into details I should like to state in a few sentences what is the policy of the Admiralty, for during the last four or five months we have been subjected to some criticism which did not altogether take into account all the action which the Admiralty have taken with regard to our shipbuilding programme.

The Admiralty policy is practically founded upon three grounds which I think are accepted by every Party in the State. In the first place, this axiom will be accepted by every one, namely, that our country must at all events keep the command of the sea, without having any regard to the cost at which that may be done. The second ground is that at the present moment we are in an unquestionable command. Our position is one which it is impossible for any one to dispute. I claim for the present Board of Admiralty no credit for that. It is the result of twenty years of various Administrations, and to them the credit is due. There is the third point, upon which, with a reservation or two, all parties will agree—namely, that the burden of naval expenditure is a very heavy one. There has been already too keen a competition amongst the various Naval

Powers. On those principles we founded the present Admiralty policy.

I will not attempt to give the House long details with regard to the comparative strength of the British Navy and the navies of foreign Powers. That I believe to be an unnecessary thing, and a method which is unnecessarily agressive, and which may be misunderstood, by flaunting before the world what is our position as regards predominance. It is perfectly clear to anybody who will refer to the very many works published in this country, in Germany, and in France,—such works as the Dilke Return, Lord Brassey's "Navy Annual," Jane's "Fighting Ships," the German book, and an excellent little book published by the French. Anybody studying the returns published in those books will be satisfied that at this moment the British Navy is in a very predominant position.

Then it is said, "Oh, but at some early future period we shall find ourselves caught up by our rivals, and we shall find ourselves in a weaker position than we ought to be." I do not think there is any fear of that in the near future. In the course of the next two years we shall have nine big ships. We shall have the four vessels of the "Dreadnought" type, the "Lord Nelson" and the "Agamemnon," and the three big armoured cruisers of the "Invincible" type, all ready by the spring of 1909; and I do not believe by that time one single European Power will have one vessel constructed and on the sea equal to those vessels. The only Power that is likely by that time to have a vessel of the type of the "Dreadnought" is our ally, Japan.

The policy that we have adopted this year is to reduce slightly our battleship programme. I do not think that is really differing from the policy of those who preceded us. In 1904 and 1905 there were considerable reductions in the Naval Votes, and the reduction was continued last year. No doubt we struck off one "Dreadnought." That was thoroughly justified, because, at this moment, the new class of ship is still largely under trial. It would have been a matter of very great and unnecessary risk for us to have entered into a very large or a very long programme. The fact of the matter is that the programmes of foreign countries which are so often brought against us are programmes on paper—they are programmes extended over a great number of years—and it is not the view of the Admiralty that these long programmes should be adopted by this country. We believe it is a wiser plan to go on the lines that sufficient unto the day is the programme thereof, and that it is far better to have a programme limited to a comparatively short time, and then from time to time to change that programme, making additions to it if necessary, but not to enter into a long programme spread over a great number of years.

It is desirable, if possible, to put a check upon naval programmes throughout the whole world. His Majesty's Government have taken that line. They have endeavoured to show that they, at any rate, are willing to agree either to propose such a thing at The Hague Conference, or to assent to any proposals to that effect that might be made. So far as The Hague Conference is concerned, His Majesty's Government have distinctly said that, whilst they are ready to enter into an arrangement of that sort with other Powers, if other Powers are ready to discuss it, or to be bound by the decision of The Hague Conference, yet, if the other Powers refuse to do so, we go into the Conference absolutely unpledged, or pledged only to this —that if foreign countries do extend their programme, we, in our turn, will also extend our programme in order to keep our relative position amongst Naval Powers. I believe that to be a thoroughly sound method of action, and one that will generally commend itself to the people of this country.

I come now to some of the points raised by my noble friend. He began by arguing in favour of greater attention being paid to smaller ships. He suggested, as Sir William White has suggested, that our battleships of the future might to some extent be designed on lines not quite so big as the "Dreadnought." There are many things to be said on both sides of that question, but I should like to point out to my noble friend that we should not be able for the cost of two "Dreadnoughts" to build more than what is now represented by three cruisers of the "Shannon" class. If it is attempted to build three battleships to command the same armaments as two "Dreadnoughts," the three ships would cost a very much larger sum of money to construct than two "Dreadnoughts," and they would also be much more expensive to keep up. They would require more men to man them, and it is difficult to believe that such vessels would be of the same power or efficiency as the "Dreadnought" class itself. We believe the concentration of armaments on a big ship is very important. We believe the four great desiderata are speed, coal endurance, armour, and armaments.

The opinion formed by the Admiralty and adopted by all the other nations of the world is that the big ship, with its large number of guns, is most likely to be effective if it has the speed to make the best use of its armament. The proposal to go back to a smaller ship is, I believe, a mistake. For us, battleships must be of great size and speed. I agree that the designing of cruisers is a very difficult matter; but here again the whole tendency of naval opinion is that the big armoured cruiser is more likely to be of advantage in war than the smaller cruiser. No foreign cruiser, I believe, would be able to stand up against cruisers of the "Invincible" class.

I agree that the Admiralty should concentrate in future on battleships. Battleships must be the first consideration, and in these days battleships and big armoured cruisers must go very much together and must be worked on very much the same lines. As the noble Lord said, the protected cruiser is nowadays almost a non-combatant ship. Mercantile cruisers can be relied on very doubtfully; they must be extremely fast or they will not be able to escape from ships of more formidable type. As to the two great ships which the Cunard Company launched in the present year, they were beyond any others in size and speed; and, if any mercantile cruisers were capable of being of service in war, it would be cruisers of this type, with great speed and coal endurance. As to the power which Lord Ellenborough proposed to give to the First Lord of extending the shipbuilding programme of the Estimates, I am afraid that Parliament would not be ready to grant such a power. I am afraid we shall always have the duty thrown upon us of putting forward Estimates year by year, and of being guided by what is accepted by the two Houses of Parliament. I believe that the present programme is one which the the House might accept.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, I should like to say a word or two with regard to what has fallen from the noble Lord, because in some respects the statement he has just made appears to me to be of vital importance. As to the programmes of foreign countries, the noble Lord is right in saying that what should guide us is not the paper programmes but the work that is actually being carried out in foreign dockyards. At the present time, the noble Lord said, the strength of this country is absolutely measured by the two-Power standard, and I believe that the noble Lord is right. But out of the present shipbuilding programme one battleship is to be dropped and perhaps others, if certain things take place at The Hague Conference. I hope the negotiations at The Hague will come to a successful issue; but I note with pleasure what the noble Lord said with regard to what our position might be after The Hague Conference, and also what his view is, and I assume that it is also the view of the Government, as to the duty of the Admiralty in maintaining the naval strength of this country.

I confess—and I have stated it in your Lordships' House before—that statements have been made in another place by the Prime Minister which have given rise to considerable anxiety in the country. In discussing the two-Power standard, the Prime Minister said that although he accepted it as a rough and ready basis of our strength, yet to consider it as incumbent on us, if it referred to Germany and France, was almost preposterous. Such words from such a source were very alarming; but the Prime Minister went further. Later on he said that, assuming France and Germany to be the two Powers with which comparison was made, it was not to be supposed that we in this country could go on laying down ship after ship to maintain such a standard. I should have thought there was only one possible answer to that proposition—that those responsible for the Navy would have to see to the laying down of the necessary ships, ship after ship, in order to maintain our two-Power standard. Therefore, I hail two observations which the First Lord has just made as specially important after those statements by the Prime Minister. The noble Lord has declared that the policy of the Admiralty is to keep the command of the sea regardless of cost; and he went further, in discussing the possible action of this country with regard to The Hague Conference. He said that if other countries increased their building programmes and their works, we should build so as to maintain our present position. My Lords, I hail that declaration as an absolute assurance from His Majesty's Government that they pledge themselves, under all conditions and at whatever cost, to maintain the two-Power standard. That is a most satisfactory statement, and I accept it absolutely, as it is doubtless intended to be accepted. If the noble Lord who originated this discussion has succeeded in nothing else, he has succeeded in drawing this most satisfactory declaration from His Majesty's Government.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order.)

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, there are no Amendments to this Bill, but I should like to make reference to a clause on which there has been some misunderstanding. I have had a letter on the subject from my noble friend Lord Falkland, and I desire to explain to him that Clause 8 does not in any way affect the soldier's hot meal. That is secured to him under the schedule of this Act. The object of Clause 8 is to give the soldier certain facilities in billeting.

*VISCOUNT FALKLAND: I beg to thank the noble Earl for his explanation, which is quite satisfactory.

Bill passed through Committee, and reported to the House without Amendment.

Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, there are down for to-morrow only two small Government Bills which we propose to postpone. In these circumstances there will be no business of any importance to-morrow, and I therefore beg to move that the House do adjourn until Monday next except for judicial business.

Moved, "That the House do adjourn until Monday next except for judicial business."—(*The Marquess of Ripon.*)

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: As I understand there will be an important debate on the Motion standing on the Paper for Monday, and that it will take some time, I desire to give notice that I shall postpone until Tuesday the Second Reading of the Municipal Representation Bill, which is down in my name for Monday.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 17th April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Swansea Harbour Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP E).

MR. MOONEY reported from the Committee on Group E of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned until Friday, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Taff Vale Railway Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).

Mr. Soames reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday the 30th April, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled "An Act to confer further powers upon the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Devonport with reference to their water undertaking and their electrical undertaking; to make further and better provision with regard to the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the said borough; and for other purposes." [Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Company and to transfer to the Company the powers of the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Order, 1906; to authorise the Barry Railway Company to subscribe to the capital of the Company; and for other purposes." [Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the county borough of Middlesbrough to construct a transporter bridge across the River Tees and to discontinue the Middlesbrough and Port Clarence Ferry; and for other purposes." [Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the time for the sale of certain lands reclaimed by the Tees Conservancy Commissioners; to enable the Commissioners to establish a superannuation fund; and for other purposes." [Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords.]

Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords]; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Darwen; and Radford; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS.

Petition from Eccles, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; from Dundee; and Hamilton; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Cambuslang (two); Coupar Angus (two); Dunnet; Eastwood; Edinburgh; Glasgow (three); Grangemouth (two); Huntley (two); Insch; Largo; Lochee; Musselburg; Oban; Partick; Pollokshaws; Stanhousemuir; and Thornliebank; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT (No. 2, 1907).

Copy presented, of Despatch from the Earl of Cromer respecting the Water Supply of Egypt [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports (Annual Series)

Nos. 3763 and 3764 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance, No. XIX. (Glasgow, No. 5) (Foundation of James S. Dixon Chair of Mining) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 112.]

TRAMWAYS AND LIGHT RAILWAYS (STREET AND ROAD).

Return ordered, "Of Street and Road Tramways and Light Railways authorised by Act or Order, showing the amount of capital authorised, paid up, and expended, the length of line authorised, and the length open for public traffic down to the 31st day of December, 1906, in respect of companies, and the 31st day of March, 1907, in respect of local authorities; the gross receipts, working expenditure, net receipts, and appropriation of net receipts; the number of passengers conveyed, the number of miles run by cars, and the quantity of electrical energy used during the year ended on the foregoing dates respectively; together with the number of horses, engines, and cars at those dates (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 298, of Session, 1906)."—*(Mr. Lloyd-George.)*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Cost of Civil Government in England and Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total cost in the last or preceding financial year of the Departments of the Lord-Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary for Ireland; also the total cost under each of the following heads: Law and Justice, Board of Works, Local Government Board, Education; and the rate per head of the population in each of the five Departments, together with the total cost of Civil Government in Ireland, with the rate per head of the population.

(Answered by Mr. Birrell.) The following statement shows the cost of the respective services, so far as they are charged on the Votes of Parliament or the Consolidated Fund, for the financial year 1905–6. The figures are taken from the statement of net cost appended to the Appropriation Accounts

	Net Cost.	Per head of Population (30th June 1905).	
	£	s.	d.
Lord-Lieutenant and Household - -	36,638		2
Chief Secretary for Ireland - - -	41,701		2¼
Local Government Board - - - -	68,618		3¾
Supreme Court of Judicature and County Court Officers, including Resident Magistrates - - -	270,414*	1	2¾
Public Education - - - - -	1,452,299	6	7¼

* Including £28,273 charged on the Consolidated Fund, omitted from statement in Appropriation Accounts.

For the figures as to the Board of Works I must refer the hon. Member to the Secretary to the Treasury, who answers for that Department. The total of the charges of Civil Government for Ireland in the year 1905–6, as shown on page 12 of House of Commons Paper, No. 278, of 1906, was

£4,746,500, or £1 1s. 7½d. per head of the population.

Inspectors and the Labourers Act, 1906.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the qualifications for the positions of inspector, under the Labourers Act, 1906, and inspector of evicted farms; what is the procedure of appointment to these positions; and what steps are being taken to secure that all qualified persons will have an opportunity of applying.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Inspectors under the Labourers Act, 1906, are appointed by the Local Government Board, and inspectors of evicted farms are appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant. In neither case have the qualifications for the appointment been formally prescribed. The fitness of the applicants is carefully considered when appointments are being made. It is open to any person to apply for an appointment, and a great many applications were received for both classes of appointment. I may mention that about 250 applications were received for the fourteen appointments of inspector of evicted farms recently made. As a preliminary step the three Estates Commissioners were requested to examine the applications and testimonials of the entire body of applicants, and to select those whom they considered most suitable. The Commissioners accordingly selected forty-two persons, and each of these ~~was~~ subsequently interviewed separately by a committee consisting of the Under-Secretary and the three Estates Commissioners, who went fully into the qualifications of each of the forty-two and formed their opinion as to his fitness for the post. As a result, fourteen names were unanimously selected by the committee and referred to me, and, after examination, I submitted the names of these persons to the Lord-Lieutenant as being the best fitted for the appointment.

Rateable Valuation of Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the gross valuation in each of the four provinces in Ireland, and the average rate per head of the population in each province; and the total income-tax collected in each year of the provinces, and the rate per head of the population in each province.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that the Answer to the first part of the Question is as follows:—

Province.	Rateable Valuation (corresponding to the net valuation in England).	Per head of Population.		
	£	£	s.	d.
Ulster - - - - - -	5,479,814	3	9	3
Munster - - - - -	3,480,437	3	4	8
Leinster - - - - -	5,119,040	4	8	9
Connaught - - - - -	1,457,476	2	5	1

I have no information as to the gross valuation asked for. With regard to the second portion of the Question, the amount of income-tax collected in each province could, no doubt, be ascertained, but as the tax is collected at the source, and not from the persons on whom it ultimately falls, I do not see what useful purpose the figures could serve. In any case they would certainly not represent the true proportion of the tax paid to population in each province.

Exchequer Bonds.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what were the amounts of Exchequer bonds current on 30th June, 30th September, 31st December, and 31st March respectively in each of the financial years from 1896–7 to 1906–7.

(Answered by Mr. Asquith.)

Exchequer Bonds outstanding.

	30th June.	30th September.	31st December.	31st March.
	£	£	£	£
1896–7 - - -	—	—	—	—
1897–8 - - -	—	—	—	—
1898–9 - - -	—	—	—	—
1899–1900 - -	—	—	—	—
1900–1 - - -	—	10,000,000	13,000,000	24,000,000
1901–2 - - -	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
1902–3 - - -	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
1903–4 - - -	24,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	20,500,000
1904–5 - - -	20,500,000	20,500,000	26,500,000	26,500,000
1905–6 - - -	34,152,600	33,303,700	23,500,000	23,500,000
1906–7 - - -	21,682,000	21,466,300	21,863,500	19,200,000

From 14th October 1904, £6,000,000 bonds under the Capital Expenditure (Money) Act are included, from 7th December, 1905, £1,000,000 under the Cunard Agreement (Money) Act, 1904, and from 7th December, 1906, a further £1,200,000 under the same Act.

Treasury Bills.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what were the amounts of Treasury Bills current on 30th June, 30th September, 31st December, and 31st March, respectively, in each of the financial years from 1896–7 to 1906–7.

(Answered by Mr. Asquith.)

Treasury Bills outstanding.

	30th June.	30th September.	31st December.	31st March.
	£	£	£	£
1896–7 - - -	5,219,700	5,219,700	5,219,700	8,133,000
1897–8 - - -	5,838,000	4,808,000	6,808,000	8,133,000
1898–9 - - -	4,808,000	5,807,700	6,807,700	8,133,000
1899–1900 - -	5,808,000	6,808,000	14,633,000	16,133,000
1900–1 - - -	16,133,000	18,633,000	19,633,000	21,133,000
1901–2 - - -	21,133,000	21,133,000	21,133,000	21,133,000
1902–3 - - -	21,133,000	23,133,000	28,633,000	21,133,000
1903–4 - - -	21,133,000	25,133,000	29,633,000	21,133,000
1904–5 - - -	25,633,000	31,633,000	31,633,000	21,133,000
1905–6 - - -	19,133,000	21,133,000	25,633,000	19,213,000
1906–7 - - -	17,213,000	19,713,000	17,713,000*	10,713,000†

* Excluding £2,000,000 paid off temporarily.
† Excluding £5,000,000 paid off temporarily.

Employment of Soldiers by the Post Office.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that, on 1st August 1906, he received a deputation of trade union officials with regard to the civil employment of ex-soldiers, and then stated that he was not prepared to favour any proposal likely to weaken the ordinary workmen's economic position; whether he is aware that the Post Office authorities are now employing as telegraphists in London soldiers who are still serving with the colours, paying them 6s. 6d. only for forty-eight hours attendance; and, seeing that this departure is contrary to the statement made to the deputation and weakens the economic position of other men in civil service, will he order its discontinuance.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The hon. Member's summary of my remarks is, I think, substantially accurate. With regard to the latter part of his Question I am informed that under a recent arrangement with the War Office a certain number of soldier telegraphists still serving with the colours are lent to the Post Office temporarily to aid in the reduction of season pressure at provincial telegraph offices. These soldiers retain their regimental pay, but as that is scarcely enough for their maintenance whilst temporarily employed by the Post Office it is made up out of postal funds to 24s. a week, which is a very usual rate of remuneration for a substitute telegraphist. Wages of 6s. 6d. a week are not offered, but there may probably be cases in which 6s. 6d. is the supplement added by the Post Office to the regimental pay. If any of these men pass ultimately into the permanent employment of the Post Office they will be placed on the same scales of pay as other established officers.

Qualifications of Irish Officials.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what professional qualifications were respectively possessed by the following heads of offices in the High Court in Ireland at the time of their appointments to their present positions, viz.: the registrar to the Court of Appeal, the Accountant-General, the present chief clerk to the Lord Chancellor, the chief clerk to the Master of the Rolls, the chief clerk to Mr. Justice Barton, and the registrar of the Land Judge's Court; whether he is aware that none of the following heads of offices in the High Court in Ireland ever practised either as a barrister or solictor, but were promoted from subordinate positions on the staff, viz.: the registrar of the Court of Appeal, the Accountant-General, the three chief clerks in Chancery, and the registrar of the Land Judge's Court; and will he state the reasons why men entering the Supreme Court (Ireland) service by open competition are considered ineligible for promotion to be heads of offices, while those who, prior to the passing of the Judicature Act, 1877, entered through patronage and without professional qualifications have frequently been promoted to these posts.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have referred this Question to the Lord Chancellor, who has furnished me with the following Answer:—At the time of their appointment to their present positions, the registrar of the Court of Appeal was a barrister of over twenty years standing, and was promoted after many years' previous service as an officer of that court. The Accountant-General was a barrister of nineteen years standing, and had many years service in the Chancery Registrar's Office. The chief clerk to the Lord Chancellor was a barrister, and had served as an officer to the courts. The chief clerk to the Master of the Rolls entered the service by limited competitive examination, and was promoted after many years service to his present position. The chief clerk to Mr. Justice Barton was a practising solicitor when appointed assistant chief clerk, and was subsequently promoted. The registrar of the Land Judge's Court was a barrister, and had for many years been an officer of the court. Save where professional qualification is required by statute, persons entering the service by open competition are not debarred from promotion to be heads of office, but they have no rights of succession to such places, and in considering questions of promotion the possession of professional qualifications will always carry much weight.

Irish Chancery Court Appointments—Professional Qualifications.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give a list of the posts on the Chancery side of the High Court in Ireland above the rank of first-class clerk for which statute requires that the occupants thereof shall have professional qualifications, and also a list of those for which statute does not require such qualifications.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Lord Chancellor informs me as follows:—Professional qualification is required by statute for the holding of the following offices, viz.:—Taxing Masters; chief clerks to the Lord Chancellor; chief clerks to the Masters of the Rolls; chief clerks to Mr. Justice Barton; Examiners and registrars in the Land Judge's Department. In some of these cases an alternative qualification of a number of years previous service in the Department is allowed. No statutable qualification is required for the holding of the offices of—Clerk of the Crown and Hanaper; registrars to the Lord Chancellor, the Master of the Rolls, and Mr. Justice Barton; Accountant-General; clerks of Judgments, Records and Writs. Legal attainments, however, are necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of these offices, and for a very long period the Clerks of the Crown and Hanaper, the Accountants-General, and the Clerks of Records and Writs have been either barristers or solicitors. The Chancery registrars were formerly appointed from the staff of the office, and had statutory rights of promotion, but the statute allowing this was repealed in 1867. Professional qualification, though not actually required by statute, is deemed necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of that office.

Superintendent of the Public Carriage Department and the Croydon Tramway Fatality.

Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the superintendent of the Public Carriage Department inspects the cars of the South Metropolitan Tramways Company; and whether any application had been made by the South Metropolitan Tramways Company for the superintendent to give evidence on their behalf at the inquest on Mrs. Wilhelmina Suhr held at Croydon.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The Commissioner of Police informs me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and that that to the second part is in the negative.

Structural and Sanitary Improvements to Provided Schools—Spreading Cost over a Period of Years.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he has received applications from any local education authorities to spread over a period of years the cost of structural and sanitary improvements of their provided schools.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this Question. A good many local education authorities have applied to the Local Government Board for sanction to loans to meet the cost of structural and sanitary improvements in provided schools, and sanction has frequently been given to such loans.

Supply of Milk in Workhouses—Precautions against Tuberculosis.

Mr. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if, in view of the statement in the Second Interim Report of the Royal Commission appointed to consider the relations of human and animal tuberculosis as to the amount of disease and loss of life, especially among the young, to be attributed to the consumption of cow's milk containing tubercle bacilli, and pending full consideration of the subject, he will consider the advisability of issuing a general order directing that all milk supplied to children in workhouses shall be boiled or sterilised or pasteurised, or subjected to some process approved by the Board, with a view to rendering it free from tuberculous poison.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The dietary order issued by the Local Government Board in 1900 contemplates that young children in a workhouse shall be dieted in accordance with the directions of the medical officer and with careful regard to the requirements of each individual child. In many Poor Law establishments the milk is treated in the manner suggested by the hon. Member; but, looking to the circumstances I have mentioned and also to the division of medical opinion on the question of the best way of dealing with milk for children, I doubt the expediency of issuing a general order on the subject at the present time.

Applications for Poor Law Relief—Case of Mrs. Gould of Birmingham.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the case of Mrs. Gould who, being destitute and starving, applied to a relieving officer of the Birmingham Poor Law Union for relief, which being refused she attempted to destroy her life; whether inquiries have been made into this case, and with what result; and whether instructions will be issued to relieving officers that in all cases of female applicants for relief immediate inquiries should be made so that the necessities of such applicants may be met.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My attention was called to this case, and I caused inquiry to be made with regard to it. I found that a committee of the guardians had carefully investigated the matter, and that they had censured the relieving officer for not having brought the case before them previously. It is the duty of a relieving officer on receipt of an application for relief forthwith to examine into the circumstances of the case and I do not understand that there was any failure on the part of the relieving officer in this respect in the present case. I may add that the officer does not admit that he refused relief to the woman, and in fact she was in receipt of it at the time of the attempted suicide. Moreover, the income of herself and family seems to have been understated by her.

Working of the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.

MR. O'GRADY: To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he has had a copy of the resolution adopted by the Leeds Distress Committee, stating that the number of unemployed as registered under the Unemployed Workmen Act of 1905 does not represent the total number unemployed; that unnecessary and irritating questions are attached to applications for relief, preventing many of the most deserving from registering; that committees are greatly hampered, both in providing sufficient permissible employment for applicants and in obtaining the necessary funds therefor; that there is a necessity for immediately introducing a Bill to amend the Unemployed Workmen Act of 1905; and that the cost of providing employment under the Act should not be dependent on voluntary contributions; and whether he proposes to take any action in the direction stated, and when.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received a copy of the resolution referred to. For reasons which I have previously explained, I do not contemplate proposing legislation to amend the Unemployed Workmen Act.

Payment of Public Vaccinators.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he is aware that the opinion is held by certain unions competent to judge that the minimum payment to public vaccinators under the Vaccination Act should be reduced from 5s. to 2s. 6d., and, whether he is prepared to accept and act upon such opinion.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have in preparation an order dealing with the subject of the remuneration of public vaccinators, which will shortly be issued.

Tuberculosis—Notification of Disease in Cows.

MR. H. H. MARKS: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if, in view of the opinions as to the danger to human life from the consumption of tuberculous milk expressed in the Interim Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the relations of human and animal tuberculosis, he will now reconsider the advisability of issuing a general order to compel the notification of cases of disease of the udder in cows which are kept for the purpose of selling their milk.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Report of the Commission is receiving our careful consideration. The matter is, however, one primarily affecting the public health, for which my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board is responsible, and with whom my noble friend proposes to confer on the subject. We quite recognise its importance.

Tenant Farmers and the Preservation of Game.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been called to the resolution passed by farmers in the North of England expressing regret that, in the case of some estate owners, the preservation of game and the enjoyment of sport are made of greater importance than the tilling of their land and the well-being of agriculture and the agriculturists, and urging the landlords to remember that their pleasure may be, and often is, at the cost of their tenant's bread, and begging them not to make the tenant farmer and his interests subservient to that of the gun and the pheasant; and, whether, seeing that the resolution is the outcome of the treatment of several farmers who have recently been turned off farms they have tilled for many years simply because, under the new Act, added power is given to tenants regarding fixity of tenure and compensation, it is his intention to amend the Act so as to prevent such action in the future.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The resolution to which my hon. friend refers has not been communicated to us and we have no knowledge of the particular circumstances which led to its adoption. My noble friend is not, therefore, in a position to express an opinion as to whether further legislation is necessary; but, as I have already indicated, the working of the Agricultural Holdings Act of last session will be carefully watched, and we shall not allow the intentions of the Act to be defeated.

American Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether legislative measures dealing with outbreaks of American gooseberry mildew in England will be in force by May next; and, if not, whether, considering that the disease spreads by spores from that month onwards, the Board of Agriculture will make a grant for the purpose of providing for a strict supervision of the diseased plantations with special reference to the carrying out of spraying and other remedial measures likely to prevent the spread of the disease.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) My noble friend has introduced a Bill giving power to the Board and to local authorities to deal with this disease, but it will not be possible to bring it into operation by May next. We have, however, issued a further memorandum, giving full information as to the best means of preventing the spread of the disease, copies of which I shall be glad to supply to my hon. friend. I am afraid there is no prospect of any Government grant being given towards the expenses of spraying and other remedial measures.

Scottish Marriage Laws.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Lord-Advocate if his attention has been called to the fact that a general desire exists in Scotland for a system of civil marriage in registrars' offices, on lines similar to that recognised in English Law and recommended in the Report of the Marriage Laws Commission issued in 1868; and if he can see his way, in order to lessen the cost of marriage and to save the time of the sheriffs, to introduce legislation on this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) My attention has not been called to this, nor am I aware of the desire stated. There are no proposals to legislate on the subject, but I shall be glad if my hon. friend will lay before me any detailed information in his possession.

MR. WATT: To ask the Lord-Advocate if he is aware that the omission in the Marriage Notice (Scotland) Act, 1878, to provide for publication of marriage where one of the parties is resident furth of Scotland has given rise to trouble and annoyance; and whether he can see his way to remedy this by legislation.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) The Marriage Notice Act of 1878 applies in the particular mentioned only to persons resident in Scotland. Any proposals to alter this would require very careful consideration, and I am not aware of any public desire therefor. In these circumstances legislation is not contemplated.

Superannuation Privileges of Extractors' Department, Court of Session.

MR. WATT: To ask the Lord-Advocate if he is aware that the Extractors' Department of the Court of Session was deprived of the advantages of the Court of Session Clerks Act by the action of his predecessor in office; and if there is any reason why that Department should not be put on the same level as the other departments and members of the staff entitled to superannuation.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) The Question appears to be based upon a misapprehension. So far as I am aware my predecessor in office did not in any way interpose so as to deprive the Extractors' Department of any advantages under the Clerks Act. The fact is, that under the Court of Session (No. 2) Act, 1838, the assistant extractor and clerks are appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the principal extractor. The rule of the Treasury applied to such a tenure of office is accordingly that they are not entitled to superannuation allowances under the Clerks of Session Regulation Act, 1889.

Assessment in Stirlingshire for Repairs to Established Church Manse.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that an assessment of 2d. per £, following upon a recent similar assessment, is being made in the parish of Kilsyth, in Stirlingshire, on proprietors who are Dissenters, and also upon Dissenting ministers, for whitewashing and decorating the Established Church manse; and whether, in view of the recent Resolution of this House that all ecclesiastical assessments in Scotland shall cease and of the provisions of the Ecclesiastical Assessments Act of 1900, notably Clause 3, Sub-section (2), of that Act, he intends to take any, and, if any, what steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I have no information on this matter other than that furnished by my hon. friend. On the general Question I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answer given to the hon. Member for Aberdeen on the 13th March.†

Enforcing of Customs Act, 1842.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Commissioners of Customs are enforcing the Customs Act, 1842, in accordance with the decision of the Court of Appeal in the case of Goldsmith Company *v.* Wyatt.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) As the case to which the hon. Member refers is now the subject of an appeal to the House of Lords, the Board of Customs have not as yet departed from the practice which has prevailed for many years.

Tribal Fighting near Jamrud.

MR. REES: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any information to the House regarding the tribal fighting which is reported to have occurred during the past few days near Jamrud.

(*Mr. Secretary Morley.*) No official information has yet been received on the subject. The Government of India have not thought the occurrence of sufficient importance to send a telegraphic report. The Malikdin Khel and Kumbar Khel are two sections of the Afridi tribe, who both occupy land in Kajurai, to the south of Jamrud.

Elementary Education in India.

SIR CHARLES SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 40–41.

State for India if he can briefly state whether any, and, if so, what, steps have been taken to improve the quality and increase the quantity of elementary education in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) It is not possible within the compass of the Answer to a Question to give a summary of what has lately been done to extend and improve elementary education in India, but if the hon. Member will refer to the Report on the Moral and Material Progress of India for 1905–6, shortly to be laid on the Table, he will find a chapter in which the facts are summarised. I am not without hopes that I may be able to say something on this subject when I speak on the Indian Budget.

Conveyance of Local Correspondence between West Indian Islands.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, who is responsible for the conveyance of local correspondence between the various West Indian islands; and what steamship subsidies are paid for the conveyance of such letters, and by whom.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Correspondence is conveyed between the various West Indian Islands, by such steamers as are available, at ship's letter rates, and also, up to the end of this month, by the inter-Colonial service of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, which has been for the last few months in receipt of a subsidy at the rate of £17,500 per annum, paid in equal shares by the Imperial Post Office and by the Governments concerned. Letters are also carried under contract by the steamers of Messrs. Pickford and Black under contract with the Canadian Government which receive a subsidy of £27,000 a year, to which the Imperial Government contributes £13,500.

Annual Leave, Travelling and other Allowances, of the Clerical Staff of the Admiralty Supply and Accounting Departments.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will grant a statement showing the annual leave, the rates of travelling, subsistence, and other allowances, if any, in London, at Home, and Abroad, permitted to each rank in the clerical staffs of the supply and accounting departments of the Admiralty.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson*). The information desired is given in the attached statements:—

Statement showing Ordinary and Sick Leave allowed.

Rank.	Ordinary Leave.	Sick Leave.	
		Full Pay.	Half Pay.
	Days.	Days.	Days.
Naval Store Officer Victualling Store Officer Ordnance Store Officer Cashier Expense Accounts Officer	42	156	156
Deputies of all Departments	36	156	156
Assistants of all Departments	36	156	156

Statement showing the Rates of House and Colonial Allowance authorised for Officers of the Supply and Accounting Departments.

Rank.	Head Office.	Home Yards.	Malta.		Bermuda.		Hong Kong.		Cape.		Gibraltar.		Sydney.		Wei-hai-Wei.	
		House Allowance.	House.	Colonial.	House.	Colonial.	House.	Colonial.	House.	Colonial.	House.	Colonial.	House.	Colonial.	House.	Colonial.
	£	£	£	£		£	$	$		£	£	£	£	£	$	$
Naval Store officer	75	75	*	†	—	—	1066⅔§	1066⅔§	—	—	75¶	65	180	120	—	—
Victualling store officer	75	*	*	65	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	180	120	—	—
Ordnance store officer	75	*	75	65	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Deputies of all departments	—	‡	50	50	*	75	900§	800§	*	100‖	50¶	50	—	—	—	—
Assistants of all departments **	—	—	40	40	*	60	800§	533⅓§	*	75‖	50¶	40	100	75	400	550

* In occupation of official residence.
† No Colonial allowance paid.
‡ In certain cases officers of this grade are allowed to occupy official residences.
§ Temporarily increased by 75 per cent.
‖ Temporarily increased by 100 per cent.
¶ Temporarily increased by 150 per cent.
** Two officers of this grade receive £50 each for being in charge of their departments.

Statement showing the Rates of Travelling and Subsistence Allowance authorised for Officers of the Supply and Accounting Departments.

Rank.	Class of railway or steamer accommodation.	Subsistence allowance when detached from usual place of duty.					Lodging money to Officers entitled to official residences, when obliged to vacate them temporarily during periodical repairs, &c.
		Admiralty Staff.					
			When absent at night, not exceeding 14 nights in one place.	After 14 nights in one place, or for the whole period if the officer knew before starting that his stay in one place must exceed 14 nights.	When absent above 10 hours from home and not at usual place of business.	When absent above 7 hours and less than 10 from home and not at usual place of business.	
Superintending clerk - - Naval store officer Victualling store officer - - Cashier - - Expense accounts officer - - Deputy store, &c. officers - - Deputy cashier - Deputy expense accounts officer Assistant store, &c., officers - Assistant cashier - Assistant expense accounts officer	First	Officers whose scale of salary goes to £600 a year - -	20s.	15s.	6s. 8d.	3s. 6d.	Officers serving at dockyards, &c. Officers on salaries above £300 a year—£2 2s. a week. All other officers—£1 1s. a week.
		All other officers	15s.	10s.	5s. 0d.	3s. 6d.	
		Staff of Naval Establishments at Home and Abroad.					
			When out all night ashore or afloat.	After 14 days' stay in one place.	Day allowance afloat or ashore when absent 10 hours.		
		Officers whose scale of salary covers £600 a year - -	20s.	13s. 4d.	6s. 8d.		
		All other officers	15s.	10s. 0d.	5s. 0d.		

Irish Jurors.

Mr. FIELD: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether, seeing that it is the duty of each Crown Solicitor in Ireland to procure on every occasion upon which assizes and quarter sessions are held a list of jurors summoned by the sheriff, and to make inquiries relative to the persons summoned, he will explain the nature of these inquiries, and whether they are always, or nearly always, made through the police, even in prosecution cases instituted by the Crown; and whether he will enumerate the various reasons for which a juror may be ordered to stand by.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) Each Crown Solicitor is left perfectly free and unfettered as to the persons from whom he should make inquiry as to the character and circumstances of jurors. He is directed not to inquire into the religious or political beliefs of jurors, but otherwise he is left to his discretion as to the nature of the inquiries he is to make. Crown Solicitors, I believe, rely very much on their own knowledge of jurors, supplemented frequently, but not invariably, by information supplied by the local police and other persons with whom they are acquainted. In answer to the second part of the Question, the reasons for which the juror may be ordered to stand by are: affinity to the person on trial, partiality, bodily or mental infirmity rendering them unfit to serve as a juror, or other sufficient ground on which a challenge for cause, if made, could be sustained. In all cases of peculiar local excitement in any particular town or district of the county, it is the duty of the Crown Solicitor, if the panel permit, to set aside all persons returned from that locality.

Borough Councils and Mounted Police.

Mr. SEDDON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether borough councils are compelled to keep a section of mounted police, with or without consent of watch committee; if so, does it apply only to towns of a certain size; and whether every town in Lancashire, except St. Helens, has a section of mounted police.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Local police authorities are not compelled to maintain a section of mounted police. This is a matter for their discretion, but I understand that in most boroughs of any size it is found desirable to make arrangements to have a certain number of mounted men when an occasion arises. I am informed that such arrangements exist in all the Lancashire boroughs except two.

Ventilation of Lobbies.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will order the electric fans in the lobbies to be set in motion when a large number of consecutive divisions are expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) This shall be done experimentally. It is not certain, however, that the fans are now necessary or desirable under the new system of ventilation recently adopted for the division lobbies.

Armour and Company and Army Meat Contracts.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether a contract for the supply of meat to the amount of $5,000,000 has been entered into with Armour and Company; and, if so, whether the traders in native meat only were afforded an opportunity to tender for this contract.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No such contract has been made.

Annual Leave, Travelling and other Allowances of Clerical Staffs of Royal Ordnance Factories—War Office and Army Accounts Department.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will grant a statement showing the annual leave, the rates of travelling, subsistence, and other allowances, if any, in London, at home, and abroad, permitted to each rank in clerical staffs of the Royal Ordnance Factories, of the War Office, and the Army Accounts Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The information is as follows:—Leave—War Office—Principals and Assistant Principals, Clerks—Higher Division, 36 days; 48 days after 10 years service. Retired Officer Clerks, 48 days. Chief Examiners and Staff Clerks, (A) If promoted to Staff Clerk prior to 6th June, 1905—36 days for first 10 years in a Staff position, and thereafter 48 days; (B)

If promoted after 6th June, 1905, 36 days. Supplementary Clerks, 28 days. Second Division Clerks, (A) If appointed before 21st March, 1890, 28 days; (B) If appointed after 21st March, 1890, 14 days; 21 days after five years service. Abstractors and Assistant Clerks, 14 days; 18 days after ten years service. Boy Clerks, 1 day for every 24 days worked, subject to limit of 12 days annually. Ex-soldier Clerks, 12 days; 20 days after 5 years. Army Accounts Department.—Chief Accountants and Accountants, 42 days; First and Second Class Assistant Accountants, 36 days; Chief Writers, 18 days; Senior Writers, 15 days; Writers and Boy Writers, 1 day for every 26 working days. Ordnance Factories, Clerical Establishment, 36 days, with 48 days after 10 years service. Travelling Allowances and Expenses. Civil Staff, War Office. The following are the approved rates of travelling allowances for members of the Civil Staff of the War Office when proceeding on duty in the United Kingdom:—

	Rate 1. When absent at night, not exceeding 14 nights in one place.		Rate 2. After 14 nights in one place or for the whole period if the Officer knew before starting that his stay in one place must exceed 14 nights.		Rate 3. When absent above 10 hours from home, and not at usual place of business but not absent for a night.		Rate 4. When absent between 7 and 10 hours from home, and not at usual place of business, also for the day of return from a journey extending over 1 or more previous days.		Class of Railway accommodation.
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	
Class A ... ... All whose scale of salary goes beyond £600.	20	0	15	0	6	8	3	6	1st
Class B ... ... Other Higher Division Clerks. Other persons not included in Class A whose actual salary exceeds £200. Retired Officers, Classes A and B.	15	0	10	0	5	0			2nd*
Class C ... ... All War Office Civil Servants not included in any other class.	10	0	7	6	3	6			2nd
Class D ... ... Ex-soldier Clerks, Class A.	7	6	5	0	2	6	2	6	2nd
Class E ... ... Copyists and Boy Clerks.	6	0	6	0	2	0	2	0	2nd
Class F ... ... Ex-soldier Clerks, Class B.	5	0	3	4	1	8	1	8	3rd
Class G ... ... Messengers other than King's Messengers.	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3rd

When a sitting room is necessary for official business, the actual expense, not exceeding 10s. 6d. a day, will be allowed if vouched.

* Higher Division Clerks, Retired Officers, Classes A and B, and Chief Examiners, will be allowed First Class fare. All members of Class B will be allowed First Class fare by steamer.

Royal Ordnance Factories.

Travelling (Subsistence) Allowances.

Appointment.	Up to 14 nights at one place.	After 14 nights at one place, or for the whole period if the official knew beforehand that his stay in one place must exceed 14 nights.	Absent above 10 hours, but not away the night.	Absent above 7 hours, but not away the night, also for last day of journey.	Class of Railway Accommodation.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	
Royal Ordnance Factories :—					
Principal Clerks - - -	20 0*	15 0*	6 8	3 6	1st
Senior Clerks - - -	15 0*	10 0*	5 0	3 6	1st
Clerks - - - -	15 0*	10 0*	5 0	3 6	1st

	Up to 7 nights at one place.	After 7 nights at one place.	After 28 nights at one place.	Absent 9 hours or more, but not away the night, also for last day of journey.	Absent 5 hours or more, but not away the night.	Class of Railway Accommodation.	
Writers with weekly pay of—	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.		
£4 10 0 and upwards -	8 0	6 0	5 0	4 0	2 0	2nd	3rd if no 2nd Class
From £2 15 0 and below £4 10 0 - -	7 0	5 3	4 8	3 6	1 9	2nd	
From £1 15 0 and below £2 15 0 -	6 0	4 6	4 0	3 0	1 6	2nd	
From £1 3 0 and below £1 15 0 - -	5 0	3 9	3 4	2 6	1 3	2nd	
Boy Writers below £1 1 0	4 0	3 0	2 8	2 0	1 0	3rd	

---

* An addition of 5s. a day may be made to these rates for travelling abroad, if necessary.

Army Accounts Department.

Travelling (Subsistence) Allowances.

Appointment.	Up to 14 nights at one place.		After 14 nights at one place, or for the whole period, if the official knew beforehand that his stay in one place must exceed 14 nights.		Absent above 10 hours, but not away the night.		Absent above 7 hours, but not away the night, also for last day of a journey.		Class of Railway Accommodation.	Remarks.
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.		
Army Accounts Department.										
Civilian Members :—										
Chief Accountants	20	0*	15	0*	6	8	3	6	1st	
Accountants	20	0*	15	0*	6	8	3	6	1st	
Assistant Accountants, 1st Class	15	0*	10	0*	5	0	3	6	1st	
Assistant Accountants, 2nd Class	15	0*	10	0*	5	0	3	6	1st	
Subordinate Staff :—										
Chief Writers	7	6	5	0	2	6	2	6	2nd	3rd if no 2nd
Senior Writers	7	6	5	0	2	6	2	6	2nd	3rd if no 2nd
Hired Writers	5	0	3	4	1	8	1	8	3rd	
Boy Writers	5	0	3	4	1	8	1	8	3rd	

* An addition of 5s. a day may be made to these rates for travelling abroad, if necessary.

Men Employed in Government Ordnance Factories and at Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the average number of persons employed in the Ordnance Factories in each year from 1884 to 1906, and the number employed at the present time, distinguishing the total numbers employed at Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the number of persons employed at present in the carriage department, the gun factory and laboratory, and the total number now employed at Woolwich; and what were the corresponding average numbers employed for each of the years 1884 to 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The information required by these Questions is as follows :—

Statement showing the average number of Persons employed in the Ordnance Factories in each year from 1884 to 1906 and the numbers employed at the present time, distinguishing the total numbers employed at Woolwich Arsenal.

Year.	Royal Carriage Department	Royal Gun Factory.	Royal Laboratory.	Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield.	Royal Small Arms Factory, Birmingham.	Royal Gunpowder Factory, Waltham.	Building Works Department.	Central Office Stores and Medical Department.	Grand Total.	Total at Woolwich.
1884–5	1,465	1,310	3,942	1,266	174	271	—	—	8,428	6,717
1885–6	2,061	1,834	5,694	2,079	220	374	—	—	12,262	9,589
1886–7	2,015	2,017	4,561	2,254	299	382	—	—	11,528	8,593
1887–8	2,016	2,089	5,019	2,143	437	420	—	—	12,124	9,124
1888–9	2,350	2,253	6,452	1,994	520	503	328	—	14,400	11,383
1889–90	2,507	2,620	6,550	2,887	849	538	455	—	16,406	12,132
1890–1	2,585	2,802	6,354	3,206	954	526	542	149	17,118	12,432
1891–2	2,313	2,501	6,584	2,281	717	725	626	194	15,941	12,218
1892–3	2,237	2,501	6,466	2,218	703	756	647	210	15,738	12,061
1893–4	2,550	2,364	5,989	1,872	456	733	677	283	14,924	11,863
1894–5	2,586	2,264	5,936	1,901	606	874	725	399	15,291	11,910
1895–6	2,487	2,182	6,155	1,769	883	568	857	479	15,380	12,160
1896	2,687	2,699	7,081	2,121	553	833	863	476	17,313	13,806
1897	2,684	2,926	7,666	2,329	480	839	923	491	18,338	14,690
1898	2,834	2,910	7,935	2,265	464	833	1,104	510	18,855	15,293
1899	3,051	2,717	7,944	2,208	458	889	1,159	522	18,948	15,393
1900	3,398	3,155	10,552	2,610	564	1,040	1,463	540	23,322	19,108
1901	3,705	3,507	10,873	2,936	700	1,224	1,838	578	25,361	20,501
1902	3,708	3,367	8,717	3,013	788	1,207	1,827	595	23,222	18,214
1903	3,366	3,085	7,256	2,788	753	1,157	1,676	627	20,708	16,010
1904	3,202	3,127	7,186	2,536	653	1,214	1,633	700	20,251	15,848
1905	3,018	3,113	6,523	1,986	492	1,080	1,772	724	18,708	15,150
1906	2,964	2,994	5,973	1,936	401*	804	1,689	708	17,469	14,328
Present time i.e. week ending 13–4–07)	2,620	2,420	5,727	2,063	—	760	1,854	664	16,108	13,285

* Average for the period up to the 9th of June when Factory was disposed of.

Disbanding of Royal Engineers (Militia) Submarine Miners.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Secretary of State for War what units of the Royal Engineers (Militia) Submarine Miners have been disbanded since 1st January, 1906; and what was the establishment of each of such units on 1st January, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The names and numbers are as follows:—

	Establishment of all ranks on 1–1–07.
The Falmouth Division - - -	83
The Harwich Division - - -	60
The Humber Divison - - -	108
The Medway Division - - -	67
The Milford Haven Division - -	70
The Needle Division - - -	58
The Plymouth Divison - - -	83
The Portsmouth Division - -	82
The Thames Divison - - -	90
The Western Division - - -	103
Total all ranks - -	804

Territorial Army—Physical Fitness of Men.

LORD BALCARRES: To ask the Secretary of State for War what steps will be taken to ensure that men enlisting in the Territorial Army shall be physically fit for active service; and whether men who, during their period of service, are reported as physically unfit, will be discharged from the force.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The manner in which and regulations under which men will be enlisted in and discharged from the Territorial Force will be prescribed under Section 8 (1) of the Bill. The Bill has not yet reached a sufficiently advanced stage to enable me to furnish the detailed information required concerning the condition of efficiency.

Closing of Coastguard Stations.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any coastguard stations in Great Britain or Ireland have been closed during the past twelve months and, if so, how many.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) In the last twelve months ten stations and fourteen detachments in Great Britain have been closed; and fourteen stations and three detachments in Ireland.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Manning.

MR. MURRAY MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many of the total number of men voted for the effective naval service of the year are borne at any given time in ships fully commissioned, in ships with nucleus crews, on shore in barracks, and otherwise disposed of in shore establishments.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The approximate number borne on the 25th ultimo was 127,277. Of this total 108,826 ranks and ratings were distributed among the four heads mentioned in the Question as follows:—In ships fully manned, 58,918; in ships with nucleus crews, 18,979; on shore in barracks, 23,403 (including 7,008 on the shore strength of the Royal Marines); otherwise disposed of in shore establishments, 7,526. The remainder (18,451) were borne in gunnery and torpedo school ships, training ships, etc.

Nucleus Crews.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Navy Estimates for 1907–8, on pages 12 and 14, omit for the first time the number of officers and men of different grades appropriated to nucleus crews, and include them with the ships on active service; and that this course prevents the House from making any comparison of figures as to sea service with past years; and whether he can state why the Board have deprived the House of this information as to the number of officers and men who are doing less sea work than others by reason of their being appropriated to partially-manned ships.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The alteration in the form of the Vote is due to the fact that, when the Estimates were framed, the details of the newly-constituted Home Fleet were not definitely known. The Admiralty have never had any desire to prevent the

House from forming any comparison with past years, and the actual number of men appropriated to nucleus crews on any given date can now be given if the hon. Member wishes. I have just given, in reply to a Question from my hon. friend the Member for Falkirk Burghs, the actual number of men in nucleus crews on the 25th March, the latest date for which figures are available at the present moment.

MR. BELLAIRS: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to include these in next year's Estimates?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I will consider that.

German and French Naval Shipbuilding.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many ships of the 1906–7 programme of France and Germany have now been laid down and ordered.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The French programme of 1906 provided for the construction of six battleships, six destroyers and twenty submarines; two of the battleships to be completed by the end of 1910, the remainining four by the middle of 1911. Although these vessels have been officially ordered it is believed that up to a few weeks ago none of the battleships had been laid down, and it is not known whether any of the other vessels have been yet commenced. The German programme of 1906–7 provided for two battleships, one armoured cruiser, two protected cruisers and twelve destroyers to be completed by the end of 1909. There has been considerable delay in the commencement of the three armoured units. The armoured cruiser is believed to have been only laid down in February 1907, and the keels of the two battleships, if yet laid at all, are believed to have been laid only within the last few weeks. Most of the smaller vessels were begun in 1906.

Tonnage of New Battleships.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the decision to make the tonnage of the three new battleships now building 650 tons greater than that of the "Dreadnought" was the outcome of experience gained in the trials of the "Dreadnought."

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The increase of 650 tons by which the tonnage of the new battleships exceeds that of the "Dreadnought" was decided upon in order that certain improvements might be embodied, and had no relation to any experience gained in the trials of the "Dreadnought."

Northern Nigeria—Railway Schemes.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have come to a decision as to the construction of the railway in Northern Nigeria, as urged by the British Cotton Growing Association and a deputation which waited on the Prime Minister on the 17th May, 1906; and will he say what is the distance from the River Niger to Kano, and the estimated cost of the first section of the line from Baro to Zungeru, and also the extension from Zungeru to Zaria and to Kano.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): His Majesty's Government have not yet come to a decision in the matter. The distance from the Niger at Baro to Kano is about 395 miles, viz., Baro to Zungeru, 125 miles; Zungeru to Zaria, 183 miles; Zaria to Kano, 87 miles. The estimated cost varies from £3,000 a mile for a pioneer line to about £5,000 a mile for a line completely equipped to deal with a large traffic.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): When will it be possible for the hon. Gentleman to make the statement on this subject which he promised me nine and a half months ago?

MR. CHURCHILL admitted that he was open to reproach for having led the House to believe he would make an early statement. He could only say that they were pressing the matter forward and hoped that when they received the report of Sir P. Girouard, who had been sent out to Nigeria, a definite decision would quickly be arrived at.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme) asked whether, as the route of the railway was practically known, steps would be taken to prevent land speculators reaping the benefit of the increased land values.

MR. CHURCHILL: The question of the land laws in Nigeria is being carefully considered with a view to securing for the Colony the advantage of any betterment resulting from the making of the railway.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is the line to be constructed entirely at the Government expense through the agency of the Crown Agents?

MR. CHURCHILL: The line is at present purely hypothetical.

Colonial Coastal Trade.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the recent Ministerial statements in the Canadian House of Commons on the subject of the coastal trade of the Dominion, the Secretary of State will inform the Canadian Government of the resolutions come to at the Imperial Navigation Conference in regard to the Colonial coastal trade, in order to ascertain the manner in which the application of the principles of these resolutions would affect the coastal trade of Canada.

MR. CHURCHILL: The questions discussed at the Merchant Shipping Conference all concern the local conditions in Australia and New Zealand, and the Secretary of State does not consider that the resolutions arrived at with Australia and New Zealand delegates affect in any way the question of the coasting trade in Canada, or that any communication with the Dominion Government on the subject is necessary.

Coloured Policemen in Crown Dependencies.

SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to recent occurrences at Nairobi, whether in most, if not all, of the Crown Colonies and tropical dependencies of the Empire, white settlers are liable to be arrested by coloured policemen.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): In view of recent occurrences, will the hon. Gentleman take care that in enlisting white policemen for the British East African Protectorate every care will be exercised to obtain men of experience and character?

MR. CHURCHILL: Certainly we will endeavour to get the best men possible.

Poll Tax on Immigrants.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that the United States of America have a well-organised immigration department, with several hundred highly-paid skilled employees, and buildings containing every requisite for the efficiency of the work and the comfort of the immigrants, and that the whole expense is paid, with a margin of £20,000, by a poll-tax on each immigrant of two dollars a head; and if, in the interests of economy, he will consider the desirability of defraying the expenses of the immigration department and making better provision for the immigrants by an entrance fee of 5s., which would meet all charges and leave a profit for the taxpayer.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): My Answer to the first part of the Question is generally in the affirmative; as regards the second part, my hon. and gallant friend will remember that the Royal Commission on Allen Immigration made no recommendation on the subject, and for reasons with which he is probably conversant his suggestion, though attractive, is impracticable.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Dover Harbour Board are applying to increase the poll-tax levied on immigrants by them, and that the Secretary to the Board of Trade held an inquiry in regard to it the other day?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, but that is only one of many considerations.

Alexandra Palace Betting Case.

MR. WATERLOW (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case at Enfield police court on 8th April, under The Betting Act, 1906, in which certain men were charged with betting in the grounds of the Alexandra Palace, a public park, in which case the betting was admitted, but in which the charge was dismissed on the plea that the grounds were adjacent to a race course; and whether he proposes to take any steps by legislation to deal with such cases.

MR. GLADSTONE: I find on inquiry that there has been a decision by the justices in the sense mentioned by the hon. Member. I do not think further legislation can be undertaken, but I will consider whether the question of law can be raised in a higher Court.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, when races take place at Alexandra Park, travelling on the Great Northern line between King's Cross and Wood Green is absolutely unsafe for the respectable public owing to the number of scoundrels who attend the races?

[No Answer was returned.]

Scottish Emigrants.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dunbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what has been the number of emigrants sailing from Scottish ports annually for each of the last ten years, distinguishing, as far as possible, emigrants of Scottish nationality and domicile from emigrants of other nationalities passing through Scotland; and whether he can give any indication as to the number of emigrants of Scottish nationality and domicile sailing from other ports of the United Kingdom during these years.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The figures asked for are too numerous to be conveniently given orally, and I propose to have them printed, so far as they are available, in the Votes. These figures relate to the gross and net outward movement of passengers, and do not specially distinguish emigrants for settlement abroad.

Statement showing the number of passengers of Scottish nationality and the number of passengers of all other nationalities that left the ports of Scotland for places out of Europe in each of the under-mentioned years.

(Compiled from the passengers lists furnished to the Board of Trade under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.)

Year.	Passengers of Scottish Nationality.		Passengers of all other Nationalities.		Total.	
	Gross outward movement.	Net outward movement.*	Gross outward movement.	Net outward movement.*	Gross outward movement.	Net outward movement.*
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
1897	8,409	4,532	1,748	—3,302†	10,157	1,230
1898	7,099	4,040	2,178	—444†	9,277	3,596
1899	7,865	4,963	3,279	244	11,144	5,207
1900	11,131	7,968	4,785	—877†	15,916	7,091
1901	11,011	7,475	3,891	106	14,902	7,581
1902	12,867	9,472	7,095	3,124	19,962	12,596
1903	20,134	16,583	7,292	1,430	27,426	18,013
1904	23,522	19,133	6,247	458	29,796	19,591
1905	27,648	22,733	11,205	3,489	38,853	26,222
1906	38,335	32,488	17,888	7,579	56,223	40,067

* Excess of out-going over in-coming passengers.
† Excess of in-coming over out-going passengers.

Statement showing the number of passengers of Scottish nationality that left the ports of England, Wales, and Ireland, for places out of Europe, in each of the undermentioned years.

(Compiled from the passengers lists furnished to the Board of Trade under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.)

Passengers of Scottish Nationality.

Year.	Gross outward movement.	Net outward movement.†
	No.	No.
1897	7,715	410
1898	8,471	858
1899	8,207	—386‡
1900	9,341	901
1901	9,909	1,495
1902	13,418	5,211
1903	16,667	6,258
1904	13,923	406
1905	13,862	2,692
1906	14,827	1,900

Hamburg Dock Strike.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can obtain from the consular authorities at Hamburg an approximate estimate of the number of English stevedores who have been employed there since 1st March.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: His Majesty's Consul-General at Hamburg reports that the total number of British dock labourers employed there since 1st March is about 4,500, but several hundreds have left again. I understand that the great majority of these men were not stevedores, but no information is available as to the actual number of British stevedores brought over.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: Have these 4,000 men lately arrived at Hamburg?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not know when they arrived. They have been employed there since 1st March.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): How many of the men were discharged from Woolwich Arsenal?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I cannot say.

Imperial Navigation Conference.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can inform the House what resolutions have so far been passed at the Imperial Navigation Conference; to what extent these resolutions alter the existing practice in regard to the control of the coastal trade of the self-governing Colonies of Australia and New Zealand; whether any representations have been made to His Majesty's Government by British shipowners as to the manner in which these contemplated changes would affect British shipping; and whether any of the self-governing Colonies have put forward suggestions dealing with the possible loss entailed to British shipowners.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Resolutions passed at the Colonial Merchant Shipping Conference will be presented to Parliament as soon as the proceedings are completed. Meanwhile, I do not think it would be respectful to the Conference to make any official statement on the subject. An authorised summary of each day's proceedings has been communicated to the Press. British shipowners are well represented at the Conference and have full opportunity of stating their views.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Is that also a reply to the last two parts of my Question?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, certainly.

Ladybower (Derbyshire) School.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the continued want of proper school facilities for children resident at Ladybower, Derbyshire; whether he is aware that these children, some of very tender years, are compelled to walk a lonely road in all weathers a distance of over three miles to Bamford to receive instruction; and what action, if any, it is proposed to take in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): Inquiries have been made as to the need of additional school accommodation for these children, some twenty-two in number, and I find that the distance to Bamford is between one and a half and two miles. The local education authority inform me that there is sufficient accommodation in the Bamford school, and that they are, therefore, unwilling to incur the expense of providing a new school for these twenty-two children. I recognise that the distance may be the cause of some hardship, but it would not, in my opinion, be possible to lay down as a general rule that a school two miles distant cannot be regarded as available.

---

† Excess of out-going over in-coming passengers.

‡ Excess of in-coming over out-going passengers.

MR. J. WARD: Is it not possible to find some means of conveyance for these children?

MR. MCKENNA: I think it would be desirable for the local authority to do that.

MR. J. WARD: Will the right hon. Gentleman suggest to the local authority that they might at least do it in winter time, especially for children about five years of age.

MR. MCKENNA: I will communicate with the local authority.

Llanychan School.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state what steps the Board are taking with regard to the proposal of the local education authority for Denbighshire to close Llanychan School.

MR. MCKENNA: The Board have suggested to the local education authority that they should defer their application for the decision of the Board as to the necessity of the Llanychan Church School until after the close of the school year which ends on the 30th instant.

Education Code.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education when the Education Code will be presented and circulated among Members.

MR. MCKENNA: The Code is now in course of preparation, but I am, at present, unable to say at what date it will be laid upon the Table. I hope it will be very shortly, earlier than last year.

Royston Headmastership.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether any directions with respect of the educational qualifications of teachers to be employed, had been issued by the local education authority for the West Riding of Yorkshire under Section 7 (1) (a) of the Education Act, 1202; if so, whether Mr. Milnes possessed those qualifications at the time of his application for the headmastership of Royston school; whether the Report of that local education authority, as to the educational grounds on which consent to his appointment was withheld by that authority, is corroborated in any single respect by the Reports of the inspector of the Board of Education; and whether he will consider the desirability of publishing the Reports of the local authority and of the Board's inspector.

MR. MCKENNA: I have no information as to the first two paragraphs of the hon. Member's Question. His Majesty's Inspector does not concur in the view which the local education authority have taken of Mr. Milnes' educational unfitness for the post. As I stated on Monday, I doubt whether, in the interests of the teacher, it is desirable to publish the Report which the Board have received from the West Riding County Council upon his teaching capacity, but as the hon. Member presses for it I will lay copies of both Reports upon the Table.

The Chantry Trust.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will consider the propriety of modifying or withdrawing the Treasury letter of 11th November, 1898, addressed to the Trustees of the National Gallery, so as to give the latter the power of refusing to exhibit such pictures purchased out of the funds of the Chantry Trust which they may consider unsuitable for this purpose, and also of eliminating from the Gallery such undesirable pictures as are already there; and, if the Treasury cannot adopt either of these courses, is it prepared to take any steps to restore to the Trustees of the National Gallery complete control over the pictures exhibited in their Gallery which they now share with the Chantry Trustees.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The Treasury letter referred to having been written under legal advice, I do not see my way to suggest any modification of it. I am not aware that, when the Chantry pictures have once been handed over to the National Gallery Trustees, any further control over them is either claimed or exercised by the Chantry Trustees.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether, if adequate proposals were to come from this side of the House so that a measure could be treated as non-contentious, he would be prepared to introduce a Bill to reform the Chantry Trust?

MR. RUNCIMAN: So far as I am informed, no Bill for the reform of the Chantry Trust would be likely to pass through this House unopposed. If the hon. Gentleman would let me know the nature of the proposals he would like to see brought forward, I would, of course, give them my consideration.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Will the Government consider the advisability of carrying out the recommendations of the Lords' Committee on the Chantry Trust of 1904, a good many of which would not need legislation?

MR. RUNCIMAN: If my hon. friend will put any points before me I will consider them.

Sandford Wills Estate, Queen's County.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the Sandford Wills estate, Garryglass, Queen's County, have signed agreements for the purchase of their holdings; that up to the time of the sale there were 300 acres of untenanted land on the estate, from forty-five acres of which a tenant named John Delany had been evicted; and that, on the eve of the sale, the agent divided the untenanted land between four persons already in possession of large farms varying from eighty-six acres to 400 acres, three being non-resident in the district, one living in Canada and his farms in Ireland let for eleven months grazing; and whether, seeing that 150 acres of untenanted land is good tillage, suitable for allotment amongst tenants of uneconomic holdings on the estate, some of whom are under £5 valuation, and nearly all of whom have to cart manure from four to seven miles to plant green crops which their own farms are not able to grow, steps will be taken to acquire this land for division amongst the tenants of uneconomic holdings on the estate.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that John Delany was evicted from a holding of forty-five acres on the Sandford Wills estate, Garryglass, Queen's County, and that the holding was taken by Joseph Dobbes, of Abbeyleix, who is a large trader, clerk of petty sessions, proprietor of a loan bank, and occupier of about 500 acres of land in the baronies of Cullinagh and Portnahinch, Queen's County; and whether, in view of the objects of the Act of 1903 the Estates Commissioners will, under the circumstances, refuse to sanction the sale to Joseph Dobbes.

I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the contemplated sale of the Sandford Wills estate, Garryglass, Queen's County, the Estates Commissioners can declare only the tenanted portion of the estate, with a view to refusing to recognise the tenancies created since 1901, and of acquiring the untenanted land for division amongst the occupiers of uneconomic holdings on the estate; and, if so, whether he will instruct the Estates Commissioners to act accordingly.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): Thirty purchase agreements in respect of the estate mentioned were lodged with the Estates Commissioners in February, 1905. In five of the cases the tenancies were created subsequent to January, 1901, one of these being the case of an evicted tenant who has been reinstated. The area of the land comprised in the four other cases is about 230 acres, and the Commissioners directed their inspector, when investigating the matter, to inquire whether this area could be acquired for the enlargement of the small holdings on the estate. The Commissioners have since received their inspector's report and will shortly deal with it, when the facts alleged in the Questions will receive their consideration. The Commissioners have received no application from John Delany, but will consider his case when dealing with the matter.

Irish Land Purchase—Inspection of Estates.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it is the practice of the Land Judge's Court in Ireland to sell estates and order the advance of public money to the owners or mortgagees without any official inspection for value or for security; if, in some of these cases, the purchasers are non-judicial tenants who have been excluded from the Land Courts by reason of holding on court leases at rents never judicially revised; and, if it is in the power of the Irish Executive to have estates sold in that court officially valued before the money is advanced, will he have this done in the interests of the purchasers and of the State.

Mr. BIRRELL: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. The Land Judge has no jurisdiction to order advances under the Land Purchase Acts. Every intending purchaser in the Land Judge's Court has to make application to the Land Commission for an advance, and when the applicant is a non-judicial tenant, it is, I understand, the practice of the Commissioners to have the holding inspected before sanctioning the advance.

Suggested Committee of Financial Experts.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the sum of money involved and the consequences to the Irish people, he will appoint a small committee of independent and impartial financial experts, with suitable actuarial assistance, to test the financial soundness of paying vendors, under the Land Act of 1903, without ascertaining the value of the thing they sell, an average of six and a half years purchase more than the average prices under the Acts which required the value to be ascertained by inspection, together with a bonus inflated proportionally with this inflated price, and also to test the financial soundness of the model calculation appearing on page 7 of the last Annual Report of the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. BIRRELL: The suggestion of the Question appears to be that purchasers are paying too much for their holdings, and upon this point I would remind the hon. Member of my predecessor's reply to his Question of 27th March, 1906, namely, that it is reasonable to suppose that purchasers have found it to their advantage, in free bargains, to pay the price they have given under the Act of 1903, and that nothing has occurred to show that the amounts so advanced are not secured.

Mr. GINNELL: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered my Question as to the appointment of a Committee of experts.

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not think I am in a position at present to advise the appointment of such a Committee.

Uneconomic Holdings as Security for Advances.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the opinion of the Estates Commissioners that uneconomic holdings in Ireland, the rents of which have been paid out of money earned in other countries, are bad security for advances calculated upon those rents; whether his attention has been called to the number of such holdings now being sold without inspection, while neighbouring untenanted land is not sold; and whether he proposes to find any remedy for proceedings for which those charged with the administration of the Land Act of 1903 decline to accept responsibility.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not expressed the opinion attributed to them in the Question. The hon. Member knows that no inspection is necessary in the case of advances for the purchase of holdings which come within the terms of Section 1 of the Act of 1903. I am not aware that those who are charged with the administration of the Act have declined to accept the responsibility which rests upon them.

Barnmeen (County Down) School.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland with reference to the necessity for school accommodation at Barnmeen, county Down, whether the Commissioners of National Education are aware that no other site is available, than that suggested by the manager; and, seeing that the rule of the three-mile limit has only recently been laid down, and having regard to the injury accruing from the present accommodation to the eyesight and general health of pupils and teachers and to the cause of education in the district, the Board will now reconsider their decision.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they are not aware whether any site other than that selected by the manager is available for building a new school at Barnmeen, nor does the Question appear to be relevant seeing that the Commissioners refused the manager's application for a building grant, not on account of the site, but upon the ground that there are already other schools within three miles of the place. The rule as to the three-mile limit referred to in my former answer is not a new rule, but has, the Commissioners inform me, been in operation for many years. The Commissioners do not see any sufficient reason for reconsidering their decision.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this school is two-and-a-half miles distant? Do not the Commissioners reserve to themselves the power to dispense with the rule under special circumstances, and has the right hon. Gentleman received a copy of a resolution passed at a public meeting of the people of the district claiming that there are special circumstances in this case?

MR. BIRRELL: I am well aware that the application of such a rule as this is always unpopular in the district affected by it, and I am sorry to see children under an obligation to go such long distances as even the one-and-three-quarter miles in this case, but I do not think that, even if I had the power I could in this case interfere with the discretion of the Commissioners.

MR. MACVEAGH: The distance was measured last week and found to be two-and-a-half miles.

MR. BIRRELL: At any rate it is well within the limit.

Unlawful Assembly at Athenry.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that persons charged at Athenry with unlawful assembly were recently sentenced by a stipendiary magistrate named Gardiner to three months imprisonment each; will he say in what court of justice were the accused persons tried; how was the court constituted, and under what statute was a sentence of three months imprisonment imposed; are the accused persons still in prison; and what action the Irish Government propose to take in reference to this matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The five persons referred to formed part of a crowd who, with drum beating and horn blowing, were proceeding to the houses of some graziers in the neighbourhood of Athenry on the night of the 4th of April. The police, believing that the object of the crowd was to intimidate the graziers, intercepted them; and the sergeant in charge, by striking matches, as the night was very dark, was able to identify the five persons referred to as being the ringleaders. After considerable difficulty he persuaded the crowd to disperse. The five persons referred to were arrested on the following day on warrants granted by the resident magistrate, who on their production before him, ordered them to give bail for good behaviour in their own recognisances of £20 with two securities of £10 each. The magistrate on this occasion sat in the police station. In this case the police seem to have acted very well indeed in inducing the crowd to disperse. The resident magistrate constituted the court, and the proceedings were taken under the statute of 34 Edward III., and the magistrate's Commission of the Peace. On a review of the proceedings, the order of three months imprisonment seemed to me to have gone beyond the necessities of the case, seeing that there was no actual breach of the peace and that the efforts of the police were successful. I have therefore been able to recommend to the Lord-Lieutenant that the prisoners should be released at the end of fifteen days, which will expire on Friday.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has considered the desirability in a case of this kind of proceeding under what may fairly be called the ordinary law, and not under an old statute of Edward III?

Mr. BIRRELL: I can assure the hon. Member that I very much prefer to proceed under the ordinary law at the sessions or assizes rather than invoke the assistance of this statute, but necessities of a case may sometimes arise in which proceedings of this sort may be thought to be more necessary—only in very limited parts of the country. I am glad that in most parts of the country the ordinary law suffices, but there are one or two parts where it is difficult to secure the prevention of intimidatory acts. I only hope that it may not be found necessary to employ this statute again, but in this particular case, having regard to the reduction of sentences to fifteen days, I cannot say I think injustice has been done.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he does not think that respect for law in Ireland would be more promoted if he proceeded under the ordinary law and not under this statute, and whether he personally was consulted as head of the executive, as to the course to be taken in this case?

Mr. BIRRELL: I make myself responsible.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Oh, I know that.

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not wish in any way to separate myself from the action of the authorities, but the hon. and learned Member can rely upon the desire of the Government to have all cases tried in accordance with the ordinary law, but at the same time there may be circumstances in which it is thought the ordinary law is not sufficient to meet the justice of the case, and although I hope the occasion may never occur again, still there may be circumstances in which it would arise.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I gather from that Answer that the right hon. Gentleman was not personally consulted. Will the right hon. Gentleman give instructions that before this ancient law is put in force again, the matter shall be referred to him?

Mr. BIRRELL: The hon. Member must leave me to exercise my own discretion, but he must thoroughly understand that I am most anxious to be involved in all that is going on in Ireland.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these people were on the public road going in the direction of their own homes and that there is no grazier living within 300 yards of the public road?

Mr. BIRRELL: I have had the report of the police upon this case; the graziers' houses are in the vicinity.

Mr. ROCHE: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire whether my statement that there are no graziers living within 300 yards of the road is correct?

Mr. BIRRELL said he would.

Alleged Dynamite Outrage at Cloghroe.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Royal Irish Constabulary authorities have yet ascertained if a dynamite outrage was recently perpetrated near Cloghroe, in the Parliamentary division of Mid-Cork.

Mr. BIRRELL: The police authorities have carefully investigated this case, and have come to the conclusion that no explosion, either by dynamite or any other agency, took place.

Agrarian Outrages in King's County.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of cases of burnings of residences, stables, offices, houses, animals and fodder which have occurred in King's County within the last six months; how many persons have been convicted in connection with these cases; how many claims for compensation have been lodged, and the amount in each case; whether, in every case of incendiarism, the property belonged to Protestants; and whether he has any information showing that these cases were the outcome of the propaganda of the United Irish League.

Mr. BIRRELL: The police have reported four such cases as having occurred in King's County within the past six months. No conviction has been had. Claims for compensation have been made in each case, the amounts claimed being £15, £40, £200, and £2,040 respectively. In the two first-named cases £10 and £25 respectively have been awarded; the other cases have not yet been decided. The property burnt belonged to a Protestant in one case only. The Inspector-General informs me that he is aware of no grounds for suggesting that these cases were the outcome of the propaganda of the United Irish League.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that public attention had been called by the King's County County Council and other local bodies, to the fires and other injuries to property, malicious in some cases and accidental in others, caused by tramps in no way connected with the county, and whether he would cause instructions to be issued to the constabulary with a view to preventing the classification of such outrages as agrarian outrages, and also whether it was brought to his notice that County Court Judge Curran at the last quarter sessions spoke in praise of the general condition of the county.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member seems to have a long list of Questions. I think he ought to put some of them down.

Mr. REDDY (King's County, Birr) asked how many of the cases reported as malicious had been withdrawn in the King's County, and whether it was not a fact that Mr. Goodbody, a well-known Protestant gentleman, was not a member of the council, and whether the Member for the Tullamore division was not also a Protestant?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. The same observation applies to the hon. Member's Questions.

Mr. REDDY said it was scandalous that such reflections should be sought to be made upon the county.

Ardagh Police Hut.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will say why a police hut for the accommodation of ten men of the Royal Irish Constabulary is in course of erection on a farm in the occupation of a man named Keane, being a portion of Crannagh Farm, Ardagh, in North Mayo.

Mr. BIRRELL: The police hut in question has been erected on the portion of the Crannagh farm which has been taken on lease by John Haire (not Keane). The hut has been built because the police authorities consider it necessary to afford protection to Haire, and the place is remote from a police station. The hut is occupied by five men.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Why is it considered necessary to afford this protection; against what sort of injury is the police hut to protect?

Mr. BIRRELL: First I am asked if protection will be given, and then I am asked why.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Yes, I want to know why it is considered necessary.

Mr. BIRRELL: Then I can only repeat the Answer to the original Question. The police authorities tell me the person in question has not been boycotted, but there has been some provocation.

St. Patrick Celebration at Armagh.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the statement of Mr. James Donnelly, of Armagh, on 19th March last, to the effect that the Ancient Order of Hibernians had the men and the guns and only wanted powder and shot to blow English rule out of Ireland, and if he has any information to show whether this body has imported any large quantity of arms for the purpose indicated since the dropping of the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act; and what steps, if any, he is taking in the matter.

Mr. BIRRELL: According to a local newspaper report Mr. Donnelly made a statement to the effect mentioned in the Question at a meeting on 18th March. The meeting was in commemoration of St. Patrick, and the somewhat intemperate language used by Mr. Donnelly may be accounted for by the festivities usually associated with the occasion. The police authorities have no information which would go to support the hon. Member's suggestion as to the importation of arms.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: The hon. Member has himself threatened to get up a bloody war in Ireland. Will the right hon. Gentleman search his house and see what arms he has there?

Mr. Finucane and the Protection of Planters.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Finucane, Estates Commissioner, gave evidence on 9th November before the Congested Districts Board Commission to the effect that, if residents in those districts to which it was suggested that planters should be transferred resented such migration, he would be prepared to place the planters so transferred under police protection, and that there were morally greater grounds for doing so than in the case of a boycotted landlord; and, if so, will he say whether these statements were made with the sanction of the Government.

Mr. BIRRELL: I have now seen Mr. Finucane's evidence to which the Question refers. Mr. Finucane appears to have expressed the opinion that migrants for whom the Estates Commissioners might provide farms on untenanted land purchased for the purpose should receive police protection in the event of local opposition. Of course the evidence of Mr. Finucane, and of all other witnesses before the Commission, was given of their own motion and without consultation with the Government.

Elphin Disturbances.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland how many, if any, extra police have been required to maintain order in the districts of Shankhill, Caldramore, and The Palace, near Elphin, county Roscommon, within the last four weeks; whether he has any official information showing that the recent disturbances in that part of the country are the outcome of the propaganda of the United Irish League; and whether, on the 1st instant, the resident magistrate had to be sent for to read the Riot Act, but was not available owing to his being in another part of that district, about two miles away, where a disturbance was raging.

Mr. BIRRELL: The force at Elphin Police Station has been strengthened by the addition of six men from adjacent stations. A force of extra police has been brought into Elphin for the preservation of the peace on three occasions, namely, on 31st March, seventy men; on 6th instant, eighteen men; and on 14th instant, seventy men. I am informed that certain local branches of the United Irish League have organised demonstrations with the object of manifesting their opposition to the grazing system. It is not the fact that on the 1st instant or on any other day the resident magistrate was required to read the Riot Act.

*Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Can the right hon. Gentleman state if there is any connection between the Camberwell and Elphin branches of the League?

Mr. BIRRELL: I imagine not, Sir.

Captain CRAIG: Upon whom will fall the cost of this large force of police?

Mr. BIRRELL: The case will follow the ordinary rule.

Leitrim Police Barracks.

Mr. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state why it is necessary to maintain police barracks at Garrison, county Fermanagh, Gublaun, county Leitrim, and Kiltyclogher, county Leitrim, as these places are only a mile and a-half apart.

Mr. BIRRELL: The police station at Garrison is two and a-half miles from Gublaun, and six miles from Kiltyclogher, and the two last named stations are five miles apart. Though the Garrison station is comparatively near to Gublaun, the district policed from it extends nine miles to the north and embraces an area of thirty-one square miles. The police authorities are of opinion that each of these stations is necessary, and cannot at present be discontinued.

Irish National Education Administration.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the date upon which the Commissioners of National Education adopted the new rule relating to the appointment of assistant teachers of the same faith as a substantial minority of the children in schools under Protestant management, and give the names of the Commissioners present at the meeting and assenting to this rule.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland upon what principle have the Commissioners of National Education decided to differentiate between schools under Protestant management and schools under Roman Catholic management, in requiring that where a substantial minority of the children belong to one religious denomination an assistant teacher of the denomination of that minority should be appointed.

I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the total number of Protestant children attending primary schools in Ireland under Roman Catholic teachers at the 31st December, 1906, and explain why these children are not permitted to have assistant teachers of their own faith, seeing that Protestant school managers are required to provide assistant teachers of the faith of a substantial minority of the children attending their schools.

May I likewise ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the province of Ulster there are 4,486 Protestant pupils in primary schools under Roman Catholic teachers, and 4,900 Roman Catholic children in primary schools under Protestant teachers; and whether he can explain why Protestant managers are to be required to provide a Roman Catholic teacher for a substantial minority of Roman Catholic children in a Protestant school, whilst Roman Catholic managers are not required to provide a Protestant teacher for the Protestant children attending school under their control.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they do not consider it desirable to give the information asked for in the first of these four Questions. The rule was promoted by the Protestant Commissioners, and was passed unanimously after being on the Agenda Paper for nearly two months. The object of the Commissioners was to remove obstacles to the combined education of Protestants of different denominations. The rule is not to be applied in schools under Protestant management in which there is a minority of Roman Catholic pupils. The total number of Protestant children in national schools under Roman Catholic teachers on 31st December, 1905, was 8,559 or 5·3 per cent. The figures for 1906 are not yet available. The figures quoted in the last Question are for the year ending 31st December, 1905.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): May I ask whether the rule referred to in this Question does not apply to the minority of Protestant children in Irish schools, and whether it is entirely made by Protestant Commissioners?

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that to be so.

MR. LONSDALE: Can the right hon. Gentleman favour us with the name of the Protestant Commissioners?

MR. BIRRELL: I have to be very delicate in handling questions connected with this matter, the Commissioners having informed me that they do not consider it desirable to supply this information.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Is it not a matter of principle that, whatever the number, the minority of Protestants are quite as much entitled to protection of Protestant teachers as the Catholics are to Catholic teachers.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not a Member of the National Board and I cannot control the decisions at which they arrive. I understand that what they have done in this matter is in obedience to the general desire of the Protestants in Ireland that there should be a combination of forces in educational matters.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire further, and if he does so I think he will be able to see that no such Protestant decision was come to?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. LONSDALE: Is any desire being expressed by the Protestant community in Ireland to have this distinction made?

MR. BIRRELL: I think it must be so.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Absolutely none. Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry?

MR. BIRRELL: I will make such inquiries as I can.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Would not all this be ended if we conceded the right to Irishmen to govern themselves?

MR. SLOAN: May I ask whether in communicating with the National Commissioners the right hon. Gentleman will recommend them to give the same protection to the minority of Protestants as they do to the Catholics?

MR. BIRRELL: I will put that before them, but I have no power to see that it is done.

Baron de Robeck's County Dublin Estate.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the county Dublin estate of Baron de Robeck, of Naas, executed agreements for the purchase of their holdings so far back as the 18th April, 1905, and that the sale has not yet been completed, with the result that the tenants are still paying interest at 4 per cent. on the purchase money; and, if so, what is the cause of the delay.

MR. BIRRELL: The purchase agreements in this case were lodged with the Estates Commissioners in June, 1905. The case has not yet reached its turn to be dealt with. It will be dealt with in order of priority, under the Regulations.

North Dublin Council—Labourers' Cottage Advances.

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board have intimated to the North Dublin Rural District Council that the Treasury will not sanction the advance, under the new Labourers Act, of a greater sum than £180 or £185 to cover the entire cost of cottage and plot; if so, will he say on what authority the Treasury have put a limit on the amount of advances under the Labourers Act; and, in view of the fact that land in the neighbourhood of large centres of population costs much more than elsewhere, and that the cost of building is higher in such places than in the rural districts, if the Treasury intends to adhere to its decision in this matter, if it has given such a decision.

MR. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have not conveyed to the Rural District Council any such intimation as mentioned in the Question. My predecessor stated in this House that he hoped that the four and a quarter millions named in the new Act would provide at least 25,000 cottages. To do this the average cost throughout Ireland should not exceed £170 on all heads. While it is expected that in certain districts cottages can be provided for less than that sum, the Local Government Board have no doubt that in other districts—those in the vicinity of Dublin for instance—the cost may be somewhat higher. In determining the amount per house which may be allowed in such districts the Board will take into consideration the average cost per cottage under the several schemes already carried out in the district. The object of the Board is to secure the erection of the greatest number of cottages possible with the money available, and in their efforts to attain this object they hope to be supported by local authorities and by Irish opinion generally.

Mayo Inspector of National Schools.

MR. GWYNN (Galway): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why an inspector of national schools, Mr. McMillan, who is hostile to the teaching of Irish, should be kept on duty in the Irish-speaking county of Mayo; and whether he will make representations to occasion this gentleman's removal to another part of Ireland, and to secure that some restraint is put upon the bias referred to.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that their inspectors are transferred periodically from one circuit to another. The question of the transfer of Mr. McMillan is at present under the Commissioners' consideration.

Strokestown Union Labourers' Cottages.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Inspector to the Local Government Board, in selecting a site for a labourer's cottage in Kilbarry, Rooskey, Dromod, Strokestown Union, county Roscommon, passed over several comparatively large farms, and selected for the purpose a site upon a farm of 12 acres, 2 roods, 5 poles (valuation £5 18s.), made up for the most part of reclaimed land belonging to a tenant named James Beirne; and whether he will ask the Local Government Board to instruct their Inspector that in taking this action he is not carrying out the object of the Labourers Act.

MR. BIRRELL: The selection of sites for labourers' cottages is made by the Sites Committee of the Rural District Council in conjunction with the engineer employed by the Council, and not by an Inspector or other officer of the Local Government Board. An inquiry will be held by an Inspector as to the propriety of confirming the scheme made by the Rural District Council, and any person interested in a site proposed to be acquired by the Council may attend the inquiry and put forward any objections which he may have to make.

O'Rourke Estate—Turbary Petition.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Irish Land Commission has received a petition from a number of tenants residing at Clooncoose, Newtowngore, county Leitrim, with reference to a portion of turbary on the O'Rourke estate which was to be given to them, and which is now included in the holding of another tenant; and if any action will be taken regarding the same.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the receipt of the petition referred to, or to identify any proceedings for the sale of the O'Rourke estate, county Leitrim, as having been instituted before them.

Glen Boat Cove Slip.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the toe end of the boat cove slip, Glen, county Kerry, will shortly be completed by the Congested Districts Board, in view of the fact that, in its unfinished state, it is a source of danger to those engaged in the fishing industry.

MR. BIRRELL: The Congested Districts Board are advised by their engineer that the work in question can only be done in very fine weather. It is hoped to commence the work in the middle of next month, if the weather should permit.

Irish Board of Agriculture—Veterinary Staff.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if a post to be called the Travelling Veterinary Surgeon for Ireland is about to be created by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; whether in view of the fact that the efficiency of the Department, its organisation and work, are at present the subject of inquiry by a Committee, he will consider the advisability of delaying the creation of this post until the Committee have reported, and the measure for the better government of Ireland is introduced; and whether he will also consider the advisability, in case such a post is created, of providing that no competent man will be denied the opportunity of competing for it.

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that no new post of the description mentioned is to be created. The ordinary transit inspection staff of the Department of Agriculture is to be increased from four to five inspectors, in order to provide for the more effective discharge of the work to be done. It is proposed to fill this post by promotion from the veterinary staff already in the service of the Department. It does not appear to be necessary to await the Report of the Committee before making the appointment.

Irish Officials—Professional Qualifications.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what professional qualifications were respectively possessed by the following heads of offices in the High Court in Ireland at the time of their appointments to their present positions, viz, the Registrar to the Court of Appeal, the Accountant General, the present chief clerk to the Lord Chancellor, the chief clerk to the Master of the Rolls, the chief clerk to Mr. Justice Barton, and the Registrar of the Land Judge's Court; whether he is aware that none of the following heads of offices in the High Court in Ireland ever practised either as a barrister or solicitor, but were promoted from subordinate positions on the staff, viz., the Registrar of the Court of Appeal, the Accountant General, the three chief clerks in Chancery, and the Registrar of the Land Judge's Court; and will he state the reasons why men entering the Supreme Court (Ireland) service by open competition are considered ineligible for promotion to be heads of offices, while those who, prior to the passing of The Judicature Act, 1877, entered through patronage and without professional qualifications have frequently been promoted to these posts.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give a list of the posts on the Chancery side of the High Court in Ireland above the rank of first-class clerk for which statute requires that the occupants thereof shall have professional qualifications, and also a list of those for which statute does not require such qualifications.

MR. BIRRELL: These two Questions concern matters which are not under the control of the Irish Government; but in courtesy to the hon. Member I have referred the Questions to the Lord Chancellor, and have received answers from him which, with the hon. Member's permission, I will have circulated with to-night's Votes.† The Answers are of considerable length.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of limiting the power of patronage in Irish public departments, and throwing more posts open to public competition?

MR. BIRRELL: That is under consideration.

Doohooma National School Teacher.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause assigned in the last quarterly return to Mr. Cryan's absence as principal teacher in Doohooma national school, county Mayo, on the 25th and 26th of February last; whether he has satisfied himself that Cryan was assaulted on the 25th February and the key of the school taken from him; and whether, seeing that this teacher's character is marked on the return sheet as satisfactory, he can say what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners on National Education inform me that managers' returns are regarded as confidential, and they are, therefore, not prepared to answer the first part of the Question. In accordance with my promise to the hon. Member, I have endeavoured to ascertain whether any assault was committed on the teacher, and am informed that the police did not witness any assault, and that no complaint of an assault was made to them by the teacher. I have already informed the hon. Member that if the teacher complains of an assault or breach of contract, the usual legal remedies are open to him.

MR. SLOAN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what were the circumstances which caused this school to be closed on two days?

MR. BIRRELL: That I cannot say.

Dromina Evicted Tenant.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of Mrs. Ellin O'Shaughnessy, of Kilabraher, Dromina, near Charleville, negotiations were opened by the Estates Commissioners more than twelve months ago, with a view to her reinstatement on the farm from which her late husband had been evicted, and that the landlord, Captain Orpen, and the present occupier of the farm, Timothy Griffin, were both consenting to her reinstatement on condition of Griffin being provided with a farm in lieu of the one he occupies; whether the Estates Commissioners through their inspector, Mr. P. V. Guiry, have repeatedly promised to get a farm for Griffin, but have not yet done so; and whether he will state what further steps, if any, the Estates Commissioners intend to take in the matter.

---

† See col. 945.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are at present endeavouring to procure another farm for Timothy Griffin, in order to provide for the reinstatement of the evicted tenant's representative in the farm which Griffin now occupies.

Muniglugh Evicted Tenants.

Mr. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it was agreed upon as one of the essential conditions of the sale of the estate of M. J. Barry, in lunacy, that the evicted tenants should be immediately reinstated; did the agents, Messrs. Nussy & Townsend, give their consent to this proposal; have applications for reinstatements been received by the Estates Commissioners from Timothy Shea, Rahalisk, and Timothy Cronin, Muniglugh; and, seeing that there is no objection whatever on the part of the owners to the reinstatement of these men, will he explain why no steps have been taken to bring about this result; and will he further state when their reinstatement may be expected.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received applications for reinstatement from the persons named, and have had the matter inquired into by their Inspector, but have not yet ruled on his report. Both of the tenants were evicted in 1906.

Belfast Police—Medical Staff.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the staff of medical attendants in Belfast was reduced from five to four, while the strength of the Belfast Constabulary has substantially increased; will he state how many of the four medical attendants reside within their districts; whether he is aware that in Cork City the police medical attendant for the northern portion of the city lives on the south side, and the medical attendant for the south side lives on the north side; will he say if the surgeon to the force exercises any supervision over the medical attendants to the Royal Irish Constabulary all over Ireland; and, seeing that the police themselves pay these attendants a gross sum of about £10,000 a year out of their salaries, whether he will arrange that they should have some voice in their selection.

Mr. BIRRELL: In 1904 the number of medical attendants upon the police in Belfast was reduced from five to four, upon a redistribution of stations in the city. Formerly there were but two medical attendants in Belfast. Three out of the four reside within their districts. In the remaining case this is not possible. The fact as to the places of residence of the medical attendants for Cork is as stated in the Question. The surgeon to the force, who is attached to the depot, does not exercise supervision over the medical attendants throughout the country. The cost of medical attendance on the constabulary is not provided by the men, but is borne on the Votes. In the circumstances there do not appear to be any grounds for giving the men a voice in the selection of the medical attendants.

Mr. SLOAN: Is it a fact that at least £10,000 are paid out of wages by these men in addition to what is given in the Vote?

Mr. BIRRELL: That may be so.

Mr. SLOAN: If it is so, and if £10,000 are paid, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the possibility of giving the men some voice in the appointment of doctors?

Mr. BIRRELL: I will look into it.

Irish Police Depot Allowances.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether five reserve policemen, including a sergeant, stationed at the depot, in addition to their ordinary emoluments, draw allowances almost equivalent to those paid to seventeen sergeants in charge of stations; will he state what duties these policemen perform in return for such reward; whether the allowances referred to are stopped out of the recruits' pay; and, having regard to the salary paid to these officials, will he explain the cause of the allowances referred to.

Mr. BIRRELL: One sergeant receives an allowance of £3 a month, and five constables receive £1 each a month, for managing the catering arrangements for over 300 recruits at the constabulary depot. A sergeant in charge of a country station receives extra remuneration of 8s. 8d. a month. The catering allowances at the depot are paid out of the general mess expenses, to which recruits have to contribute. The duties are heavy and the hours long, and the Inspector-General considers the remuneration to be well earned.

County Magistracy.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware of the disparity between the numbers of Conservative and Liberal magistrates, and of the fact that in at least one county division there is not one single Liberal magistrate, except ex-officio magistrates; and if he will take steps to provide the Lord Chancellor with sufficient assistance to enable him to put an end to the existence of a Bench selected almost entirely from one Party without further delay.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): I cannot possibly know whether or not the fact is as suggested in regard to one division of a county which is not named, but the condition of things is well known. It is impossible to correct it all at once. The Lord Chancellor has, as I have already said on previous occasions, a duty in law which he cannot depute to others. He has no need of any assistance.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorks, E.R., Holderness): May I ask whether for the future the Government intend to consider a seat on the Bench a reward for political virtue?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No; I think a seat on the Bench ought to be a reward for local public service, but not for either social rank, property connection, or any other consideration of that kind.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): Do the Government think that in making selections for the exceedingly important post of Justice of the Peace the accident of a man's political opinions ought to be in any conceivable way considered?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I entirely agree with the hon. Member, and I wish that had been the rule throughout. If that had been the rule in times past, we should not see the extraordinary condition of the Bench generally which we now see. We are engaged in redressing the inequality of the present condition of things. Owing to the extraordinary fullness of the Benches in almost every part of the country, that is a thing which can only be done gradually.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) Does the right hon. Gentleman mean by redressing the inequality, recommending people for appointment to the position of Justice of the Peace because of their political opinions?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have already said that I disclaim any intention of that sort or of keeping that in view; but what I assert is that men who have shown their capacity for acting as magistrates and done good public service in the locality, and are likely to have the confidence of their neighbours—these are the men we ought to recommend.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN: I should like to ask on what the right hon. Gentleman bases his accusation that appointments to the magistracy—

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is going a very long way from the Question on the Paper.

MR. LUPTON: Is it not a fact that the present Lord Chancellor has appointed 700 Conservatives to the County Bench?

*MR. SPEAKER: That really does not arise out of the Question.

Imperial Defence—Mediterranean Stations.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Military authorities at Malta were asked to give evidence before the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for War, in conjunction with the Admiralty, which visited the Mediterranean stations in 1906.

SIR. H CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed that the views of the Military authorities at Malta were embodied in a Memorandum of the 29th October by a local Committee presided over by the General Officer Commanding in Chief. This Memorandum was fully considered in connection with the Report of General Owen's Committee. It is evident that the general policy in regard to fixed defences throughout the Empire can only be determined by His Majesty's Government.

In reply to a further question by Mr. Ashley,

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said: The Committee reported to the Government, who have their Memorandum before them.

STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders, as amended, be printed. [No. 113.]

IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 114.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 114.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 159.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing,) Shipping, and Manufactures: Sir Edward Strachey and Mr. Lloyd George; and had appointed in substitution; Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill; Mr. Glover, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. William Johnson, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Cochrane, Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Lambton, Mr. John Hope, Mr. William Edwin Harvey, Mr. Billson, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. Raphael, and Mr. Cory.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

SHOP CLUBS ACT (1902) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To extend the provisions of Section 1 of the Shop Clubs Act, 1902, to membership of the trades unions and industrial and provident societies," presented by Mr. John Ward; supported by Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. Brace, Mr. Maddison, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Steadman; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 160.]

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): I have to ask the leave of the House to introduce a Bill for the constitution of a Court of Criminal Appeal, and for extending the powers of our tribunals to review convictions on indictment for criminal offences. It is proposed to end a controversy which at recurrent intervals for sixty years has engaged the attention of Parliament. The settlement which I invite the House to adopt will create appellate rights against convictions for crime, similar to those which exist in relation to adverse verdicts in civil causes. Liberty will thus be put upon an equality with property, and the consequences of judicial miscarriage will receive in each case similar protection. The administration of our criminal law has attained its present unsurpassed reputation in spite of defects of procedure which are irreconcilable with the acknowledged principles of all sound jurisprudence. Various mitigating causes have tended to obviate the defective operation of an imperfect system. The generous bias of our courts towards the innocent until they have been shown to be guilty; the conscientious solicitude and high character of our Judges, and the tempering jurisdiction of the Home Office have done much to accomplish this result. But justice has blundered. Innocent men have been convicted, and the number of the victims of judicial miscarriage during the last few years has not been inconsiderable. This question, owing to recent incidents and developments, has been forced to the front. The Royal Commission recently reported that the resources of the Home Office were neither adequate nor satisfactory. The admissibility of the evidence of an accused person in his own behalf, tainted as it often is by falsehood in regard to collateral matters, tending to prejudice a good case and to confuse the issues to be tried, makes the conduct of criminal trials more difficult. Public sympathy in recent striking instances has been aroused by the misfortunes of men who have been called upon to suffer that most terrible form of moral torture which confounds the innocent with the guilty, and condemns them to a common fate. An enterprising Press has rushed in where jurists have feared to tread, and retrial by newspaper threatens to take the place which ought to be occupied by the process of rehearing before a judicial tribunal. Last, but not least, the delicate and difficult duties of the Home Secretary have been discharged under the pressure of public agitation, which has made calm and independent judgment well-nigh impossible. These considerations have led the Government to the conclusion that the time for some change has arrived. Last year a Bill was introduced by the Lord Chancellor and passed through the House of Lords, which will, I trust, ever associate his name honourably with this great change in our jurisprudence. The present measure differs in material respects from that which then passed through the other House. In its present form, I trust it will not meet with those hostile Motions which threatened the introduction of its predecessor. I have given careful consideration to the criticisms, many of them most able and cogent, which have reached me from many quarters, and I trust that I shall be able to count former opponents of the measure among its present friends. The Court will be constituted of seven Judges of the King's Bench Division, selected and presided over by the Lord Chief Justice of England. They will be invited to undertake the duties arising under this legislation, in addition to the functions which they now discharge. The right to appeal in matters of law will be unqualified; in matters of fact it will take place with the leave of the Court of Appeal. This proposal revives an ancient procedure, and it is attended by this great advantage, that the Court will be able to prevent the abuse of its process by the raising of unfounded and frivolous contentions. There will be no new trial. The scandals to justice, which must very often occur on the retrial of a criminal cause, will not happen in consequence of the provisions of this measure, and the accused person will be spared an ordeal which is consequent upon no misconduct on his part. The Court will have ample powers to get at the truth. They will be able, if necessary, to summon fresh evidence. When they have satisfied themselves, so far as they can, of the true merits of the case before them, it will be their duty to determine whether the conviction should stand, should be set aside, or should be modified, and whether the sentence which is challenged should remain as it was pronounced, or should be brought into harmony with principles of general application, by which the duration of the punishment is made to correspond with the gravity of the crime. This is not a rich man's Bill. It was said that the last measure possessed that character. It will not be said of this Bill. An official is appointed whose duty it will be to obtain the materials which it is necessary to place before the Court for the consideration of the petition of every appellant; and if professional assistance be required a solicitor and counsel will be appointed to argue his case. This

Bill differs from the last in one respect which will be appreciated by my legal friends who are Members of this House. The machinery will not be left to be framed by *ex post facto* regulations. It is substantially embodied in the Bill itself, and the whole history of the litigation may be reviewed from beginning to end. A Rule Committee will be appointed, which will have power either to complete or to modify or amplify the procedure prescribed as experience may dictate. The Court of Crown Cases Reserved will have its jurisdiction transferred to this tribunal, but the economic and excellent machinery in connection with that tribunal will remain untouched. The prerogative of the Crown will be unaffected, but the Secretary of State will have the inestimable advantage of being able to take the opinion of the Court of Criminal Appeal upon any question on which his advice to the Sovereign may depend. This is the measure which I would like the House to consider. It is a non-Party Bill. I am sanguine enough to believe it will be non-contentious also. Notwithstanding, in my humble opinion, it yields to none in the order of its importance. It affects immediately and possibly for all time the administration of justice in that sphere of its operations in which it touches the defence of personal security, which is the absolute condition of individual happiness and welfare on the part of every member of the community throughout all classes of our population. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to establish a Court of Criminal Appeal, and to amend the Law relating to Appeals in Criminal Cases"—put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. Secretary Gladstone.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

"To establish a Court of Criminal Appeal, and to amend the Law relating to Appeals in Criminal Cases," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 161.].

PATENTS AND DESIGNS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that early that morning, about 12.15, the Patronage Secretary put down certain Bills for discussion for "to-morrow." Amongst those Bills was the Patents Bill, which appeared in the Orders of the Day. What he desired to ask was whether when those Bills were put down by order of the House for one day it was competent for the Government after the House had adjourned to secure their advance by one day.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must take the responsibility for having made the alteration. The truth is that it escaped the Patronage Secretary and myself that it was past midnight, and consequently "to-morrow" became "today." I think the House generally understood that we should take this Bill on Wednesday.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich), in supporting the Second Reading, said the first patent, as far as he could discover, was granted in 1626 and recited that—

> "Because much time and labour and money has been spent by Walter Drummond, and because the invention may be of use and advantage to the State the King grants a monopoly, but should the said Walter Drummond fail to reduce to practice within three years his scheme of patent, the said patent shall then lapse."

From that it was perfectly clear that the patent had not been granted to the inventor for his ingenuity alone, but also for his services to the State in introducing a new manufacture to the realm. It appeared to him that those conditions were just, and ought to govern our present practice, and that no patent should be granted without a patentee's being required to work his invention in this country. If, however, all countries did as we did, that was, grant a patent to anybody and everybody who applied, there would be nothing to object to; but when all other countries took a different view, he thought there was not much to be said for our present practice. In Germany, if a patent was not worked within three years, it could be revoked and declared void. In France, if a patent was not worked within two years it could be revoked. In fact, in practically every industrial country, including Japan, patentees had to work their patents, or to get them worked within a certain time of their being granted, or their grant might be revoked. We were the only country in Europe that allowed a patentee to take his grant away and work it where he liked, or sell it to whom he liked. The result of this careless liberality was that foreigners came here and got patents granted them without ever having the slightest intention of working them in this country. They not only did this, but, aided by powerful associations and syndicates, particularly in Germany, they used these patents to filch our trade away, and in this, he was sorry to have to say, they had often been successful. In 1903 we had granted nearly 8,000 patents or monopolies to persons residing outside this country, in fact, more than half the patents taken out here, and the most important ones had been taken out by foreigners. We granted a larger number of patents (about 5,000 more) than Germany did every year, although the population of Germany was one-third greater than our own. Some of these patents were only taken out for blocking purposes, and were unscrupulously used when our manufacturers wished to make any article which would compete with a German production. Others which were of importance were taken abroad and were used to start industries there by new and improved processes, and so superseded industries carried on in this country. Thus our manufacturers suffered great injury and our workpeople lost their employment. Although a patent lasted only fourteen years it was long enough to establish the industry abroad, and once established there, with trained labour, experience, and an organised system of distribution, it was no easy matter to get it back again. What they said was that the granting of a patent, which was really a monopoly, was in the nature of protection, and that for every monopoly granted there should be a *quid pro quo* to the State granting it. We got no *quid pro quo* for the monopolies we gave, but we allowed the person to whom the monopoly was granted to produce his patented articles solely abroad; in other words we ran contrary to the doctrine of free trade, not for our own benefit, but for the benefit of the foreigner. Most patents that were granted to Englishmen were probably worked in this country, but they had to remember that we had no monopoly of genius in this country, and that as the population of America and other European countries was 440,000,000 and that of the United Kingdom was only 40,000,000, we could not expect to produce the same number of inventions as they did; and when we considered also that they were advancing in their manufacturing capacity by leaps and bounds, it followed that the number of patents granted to foreigners would greatly increase, and that if the present state of affairs was allowed to continue we should not only lose our share of the new industries which were so rapidly springing up, but we stood a very great chance of losing the supremacy we still held in old ones. The great industrial progress of Germany had recently figured very largely in discussions on our fiscal system. That Germany had made enormous strides could not be denied, and in his opinion the advantages that she had enjoyed through our absurd leniency in regard to patents had been one great factor in the success which she had attained, in some degree at our expense. The chemical industry of Germany had increased rapidly, and now amounted, with allied industries, to something like 70,000,000 per annum, and part of that trade had been taken away from this country. Was it not quite time there should be some close investigation to see the cause? When it was considered that the process of manufacturing aniline colours from coal tar was discovered in this country, that the industry was commenced and flourished in this country, that we were the greatest producers of the raw material from which the colours were made, that we had cheap fuel and a favourable geographical position, and that we were also the greatest consumers of the finished article, and that we had allowed this enormous trade to be taken way from us, it was, he thought, humiliating. There were in Germany engaged in this manufacture five firms, who employed something like 26,000 hands, and had an aggregate capital whose market value was something like £16,000,000 sterling. Most of the labour employed in these works was unskilled labour, and was the very kind of work which would absorb our unemployed if we only insisted that there should be a *quid pro quo* for the monopolies we granted and that they should not be taken away and used to find work for foreign labour in foreign countries at the expense of our fellow-countrymen. It was a well-known fact that the foundation of the aniline colour industry in Germany had been laid by the manufacture of alizarine, for which a number of patents for working it commercially had been obtained in this country, with the result that everyone was able to make and sell in that country, whilst in this country it was a close monopoly, and our dyers were charged an enormous price for an article which could be just as well made by us as by Germans. The patent for this article had now lapsed, but the business had been so firmly established in Germany both by the scientific process of manufacturing and by the organisations for distribution, that we had not been able to wrest the trade from them. But he would like to call the special attention of the House to the question of artificial indigo. We employed something like 200,000 people in India on the indigo plantations. The Germans had discovered an artificial indigo which, on account of its much lower price, was superseding the vegetable product. The capital employed would, he supposed, be lost, and German labour and German capital employed in its stead. In this case it would be seen that we were losing an industry, which had found employment for thousands of our Indian fellow-subjects, through granting the Germans a British patent or monopoly without imposing upon them any obligation to work it in this country. Had we said to them as they said to us: "If we grant you a patent or monopoly for the sale of this article, you must, in return, manufacture the article here," we would by now have had large works in this country giving employment to numbers of labourers. By our patent laws, as they were at present, we were benevolently fostering great industries in Germany, to the detriment of the manufacturers, consumers, and working-classes of this country. The supporters of this measure wanted no interference with free trade. All they asked was just and equitable treatment. They held that monopolies should not be granted to foreigners to be used to handicap us in that competition which was every day becoming more acute. Hon. Members opposite seemed to think that this was a question of protection. It was not a question of protection. We had been granting thousands of patents to foreigners and getting nothing in exchange. What was now proposed to be done was to say to the inventor: "We are going to grant you a monopoly of the strictest kind possible, but if we do that, the country at least ought to have some recompense for having done it." The patent ought not merely to be a prize to the inventor who applied for it. The country where the man was granted protection ought at least to have some share in the benefit. If a man obtained a patent in this country he ought to manufacture the goods here. He thought this Bill would go some distance towards stopping foreigners from obtaining an advantage in our markets and giving nothing in exchange.

*Mr. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that when the Second Reading of the Bill was moved many hon. Members waited to see whether the senior Member for Merthyr Tydvil would move the Amendment of which he had given notice. Clause 10 of the Bill, against which the Amendment was obviously directed, appeared to most Members of the House to do nothing but justice to British inventors. But hon. Members opposite seemed to think that there might be found in it some trace of that fiscal reform or fair trade, of which they were so much afraid. However, it seemed that the hon. Member who had given notice of the Amendment was not bold enough to move it, and he therefore proposed to put before the House some general criticisms of the measure. Under the new Rules just passed the Bill would probably be sent to a Standing Committee, so that he and many others might have no chance of criticising the details. They must, therefore, call attention to the defects of the Bill on the Second Reading. He recognised that the intention of the Bill was to improve the patent laws, and also that there were many clauses which would be of real use to inventors in this country. He did not intend to vote against the Second Reading. But he was a little bit afraid that,in attempting to improve the patent laws and the position of the inventor, the Bill might make that position worse in some respects than it was now. There were clauses in the Bill which would cast on the inventor, and especially the inventor of moderate means, a heavy burden which he would not be very well able to bear. The effect of these clauses would be to discourage the taking out of patents, and thus many small inventors would be deprived of the benefits of their ingenuity. He instanced Clause 2 with respect to the "deposit of samples in the case of chemical inventions," as a serious matter. There were inventions in chemistry which related to intermediate processes and which could not be exemplified by samples; and there were other inventions of which samples could not be provided without considerable expense. Unless great care was taken that cause would be found impossible to work. Having taken the opinion of others on the question, he did not think that particular provision was necessary, and he was inclined to say that on the whole it would be better not to have it in the Bill. A matter of more importance was Clause 6 "Grounds of opposition." It provided that the grant of a patent might be opposed on the ground—

> "That the invention has been described or claimed in any complete specification for a British patent which is or will be of prior date to the patent the grant of which is opposed, or that the invention has been published in this country prior to the date which the patent would bear if granted, or on the ground that the nature of the invention or the manner in which it is to be performed is not suffcently or fairly described and ascertained in the complete specification."

If this provision were passed, almost any application for a patent might be opposed, there being thouands of old specifications lumbering up the patent office which might be cited in opposition to new applications. He was afraid that the clause might lead to many useful patents meeting with serious and formidable opposition. That would cause very serious expense which many small investors would not be able to bear. It would be found that an application for a patent, instead of being, as now, a simple and not very expensive matter, would become, in many cases, very expensive indeed, with the result that inventors would be discouraged from taking out patents. The same observation applied to Clause 9 with reference to "Power of comptroller to revoke patents on certain grounds." They knew what the competition in trade was—the competition of large firms against small ones, and of foreign against British firms. These firms would pay almost any sum in order to get rid of a patent which interfered with their operations. There would be a temptation to large firms to use Clause 9 as an engine of oppression against men who could not afford the cost of defending their inventions. If so, Clauses 6 and 9 would throw on inventors a very serious burden indeed. He knew that was not intended, but he thought that would be their effect, and they ought, therefore, to be carefully considered in Committee. Another important point was as to the tribunal which was to have the decision of these matters. Under the Bill, as it stood, questions as to the grant of patents, questions of revocation, and others, which involved a very careful consideration of facts and of law, and very often of scientific questions which could only be determined by a skilled Judge, or arbitrator, were to be decided by the Comptroller. He had not a single word to say against the Comptroller or against the way in which he exercised his functions at the present time, but he was an official with administrative duties. He had charge of a very important department in which he was certainly engaged in work mainly of an administrative character. He was appointed for that purpose, and no doubt he found the work heavy enough. Now it was proposed to throw on that official, who was not a Judge, the duty of deciding the difficult and intricate questions which arose on applications for, and revocations of patents. Only recently there was an application for revocation of a patent which occupied seven or eight days in hearing before a learned Judge. Similar cases would arise under the clauses of this Bill, and was it really intended that cases of that kind should come before the Comptroller, who, though a very competent official, could not properly undertake the work? He did not think that inventors and others interested would be satisfied with that proposal. There was to be an appeal to one Judge, whose decision was to be final. He thought every case of importance would be appealed. There was no branch of the law where appeals were more frequent, or so certain to occur, as in patent cases. If in every important case there would be an appeal, why did not the Government take their courage in both hands and provide at once that those cases should come before a Judge? Half the expense would be saved, a hearing would be had once for all, and a decision would be obtained satisfactory to the litigants. Another point was that it was not very satisfactory to have appeals taken from the Comptroller to a law officer. He did not think it was right to give judicial powers to the law officers of the Crown; only a Judge should exercise them. If a Patent Court, such as he had suggested, were set up, those appeals from the Comptroller's decision which now went to the law officers would also go direct to the Court. Again, let them take the question of actions for infringements of patents. As many Members knew, a person could bring an action for infringement and choose his Court—usually the Chancery Division. But the result was that those patent cases which were foreign to the ordinary work of the Chancery Division came now before one Judge and now before another; and although the cases were disposed of with great ability, still, that was not the best way of securing consistent decisions. These cases also should go to a Patent Court for which there would then be ample work. There were also the interlocutory applications in patent cases, which also ought to go before the Patent Judge. He did not say that the patent Court must necessarily be always presided over by the same Judge, who might in that case get into a groove; but the Judge might be appointed for a year, and another Judge for another year. He hoped that the Government would consider, before the Committee stage, the suggestions he had made, and discover a method by which they could be given effect to. It was true that Clause 17 provided that all appeals from a decision of the Comptroller should be made to such Judge of the High Court as the Lord Chancellor might select for the purpose, and that the decision of that Judge should be final. But that did not meet the matter at all, because that provision was confined to appeals under this Bill and would not apply to the existing patent litigation which was very heavy indeed. The views which he had expressed were, he knew, held by many men of experience in the legal profession and by commerical men who had a real interest in the matter.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he desired briefly to call the attention of the President of the Board of Trade to an aspect of the Bill which seemed to him been overlooked by the Board. Clause 16 made void conditions or contracts which extended far beyond use of a patented article and would in many cases most seriously hamper the licensee in his trade. He was not sure that Clause 16, as drawn, covered the whole ground, and he thought it should be amplified in Committee. His main point, however, was that Clause 16 was not retrospective. He wanted to point out how very serious would be the position in which those persons would be who were bound by existing contracts and by conditions similar to those which this Bill would make void in the case of future contracts. If the Bill became law those persons would be left in a much worse position than they were now in; that was to say, they would be bound by onerous and oppressive conditions and yet have to compete with men, who coming after the passing of this Bill, would not be hampered in a similar manner. Something ought to be done in the interests of those persons. Possibly a remedy might be found by extending Clause 11 which related to petitions for the revocation of patents. He suggested that upon a petition for the revocation of a patent the Court should take into account the conditions of existing contracts similar to those which this Bill would make void in the case of future contracts. That might be one of the grounds on which a patent might be revoked. Of course he was aware that the mere revocation of a patent would not, of itself, put an end to the existing contract, or relieve the party to the contract from the onerous conditions. But in the case he was supposing it would work out in this way. If Clause 11 were altered in the direction he had indicated the effect would be that, through fear of the patent being revoked, such pressure might be brought to bear on the owner of the patent that he would be willing to come to reasonable terms with the persons bound by these contracts. He hoped that, if not in this way in some other way, means would be found in Committee to meet the cases of many persons in the country, especially in the boot and shoe manufacturing industry, who at the present time were bound by the most onerous and oppressive conditions.

*SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that he approved of some of the suggestions which had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Kingston in regard to Clauses 10 and 17, and as to the constitution of a Patent Court; and he hoped that the latter suggestion would be embodied in the Bill at a later stage or in subsequent legislation. As to the general scope and character of the Bill he was convinced that the President of the Board of Trade had endeavoured in a comprehensive way to cover many of the difficulties that had arisen in regard to Patent Law and to adjust in an equitable manner conflicting interests. They were all anxious to give the greatest possible encouragement to invention. It was part of the life-blood of a free trade country to encourage invention, and there was no taint of protection in giving an inventor a guarantee that he would be protected in the use of his idea and his property rights in it during a reasonable period. The points which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Bethnal Green were of grave importance in framing a law dealing with patents in a free trade country. The manufacturers of a free trade country ought to, and he believed did, welcome every invention to which they could obtain access from abroad which would help to develop their industry, earn them larger profits, and help the community in which they lived. We in this country welcomed ideas and improvements from abroad, but the position of the boot and shoe industry at the present moment was of singular interest and vividly illustrated what might indeed happen in a free trade country in regard to other trades. They were all aware that the old-fashioned methods of hand-sewn work of twenty or thirty years ago had begun to disappear for some years past, and it became a matter of life and death to that industry to avail itself of all new inventions in machinery, and especially those produced in America. In the Eastern States of America, where this was the leading trade, the application of machinery to it had been carried to the highest possible point. It had become almost imperative that the manufacturers should acquire that machinery for use in this country at any cost and risk to themselves. In consequence of this necessity they had placed themselves, it might be said unwisely and without sufficient regard to their own interests or to the interest of the community, under the most onerous conditions to acquire the right to use this machinery. So restrictive and so prejudicial to the great industries of this country, and to the highest interests of trade and commerce generally were these conditions that he contended that there ought to be in a Bill like this some machinery for dealing with conditions which were wholly prejudicial to our trade. What had happened was this. These American manufacturers of machinery required for the purposes of the boot and shoe industry had bound themselves together and had accumulated a large amount of capital. They had brought their capital and their ideas to this country. Nobody grudged them that. He welcomed the access of American capital and manufactures to this country. But whilst we welcomed new ideas and fresh stores of raw material from every part of the world and the influx of capital and the products of industry, and whilst we wished to guarantee the fullest patent rights which the law granted the inventor for the use of his inventions, there was another side to the question. It was one thing to do that, but it was quite another for an American company or syndicate to come over here and patent not only its ideas but all the ideas of the American Protectionist trusts, and to introduce the most tyrannical form of monopoly, restricting the commercial and industrial enterprise and freedom of our manufacturers, and reducing them to the position of having sold all their liberties as industrial men. Our manufacturers would not grudge these men payment for the use of their ideas, or their full reward for that use. That would be wholly inconsistent with the law and traditions upon which the whole edifice of British trade had been founded. But the conditions which had been imposed in this coercive fashion, when it was almost a matter of life and death for the British manufacturer to accept anything which was in the nature of an improvement of the machinery imported, were most oppressive. Our manufacturers entered into agreements which were to last for twenty years, six years beyond the length of the life of a patent in this country, and they agreed to continue to pay the royalty on any improvement or new attachment whether it was patented or not, which might be added to that machinery solely at the will of the manufacturing company. Without the consent and without the leave of the manufacturer, the American syndicate might come and attach to the machinery any alleged improvement and they obtained a fresh lease of their royalty upon the machinery. Under their contract they not only took the right to have the royalty during the period of the patent, but they could prolong the life of their royalty and levy a toll upon the industry for an indefinite number of years. Another group of covenants was also very serious and gave the syndicates and companies far more extended privileges than those which the Patent Laws of this country had ever given to any inventor. The Patent Law debarred no one from any access to a new invention, but these companies not only provided that their machines should be used in a fair way, but the users of them were debarred from using any other machines in connection with the machines which had been leased by the company, and that again was extended by this process of adding improvements and attachments. If the business of a manufacturer was successful and some work came in he had no option. He could not go to a British maker of machinery or to one in Belgium, Germany, or elsewhere, but was bound for ever, or at least during the period of the lease or the prolongation which the syndicates obtained under these covenants, to go on obtaining machinery from and dealing with these companies. That seemed to him a tremendous and improper expansion of any right which it was intended to give to any invention by the Patent Laws of this country. Not only that, but if a firm of manufacturers under good advice had expended a large sum in obtaining machinery from Germany, that had to be stopped and machines used which came under the conditions of the hiring company. Furthermore, if one of these manufacturers had taken a machine from the company which only carried out one of the many operations of the industry he was bound to use no machinery from any other source for any of the other operations, but to obtain every detail of the machinery used from the syndicate, and any other machinery was agreed to be scrapped. Reference had been made to the revoking of patents and there were many processes for declaring them to be invalid, but under these contracts it was provided that a man should continue to pay fees and royalties in cases in which patents relating to the machine which he had hired had been revoked or otherwise declared to be invalid. It seemed to him that this was a monstrous and intolerable state of things which should be dealt with in a decisive manner by legislation. He had seen several leases of machinery containing these provisions, and he was assured that some of the leases actually contained covenants and provisions requiring the lessee to assent to any subsequent condition which the company might impose. He contended that these conditions which had been pressed on a great industry amounted to duress. There ought to be a full and entire remedy for this state of things, and his hon. friend the Member for Bethnal Green had said that Clause 16 ought to be made retrospective. They who were old Members of the House of Commons were well aware how very difficult it would be to get the House of Commons, not to say another place, to assent to a proposal cancelling existing contracts. Of course, such a course presented great difficulty. In Clause 11 of this Bill some attempt, however, seemed to be made to move in that direction. If they had the power to revoke a patent, not only because the owner of it was not using it and affording proper advantages and facilities to the public who might use it, it seemed to him that they ought to have a clear and effective provision in this clause, and he hoped that in the course of the Bill through Committee such additions might be made to Clause 16, which seemed very good, as far as it went, to prevent as regarded future contracts all the injuries to which he had alluded. In regard to syndicates holding such a powerful position, they ought definitely and in terms to bar out such provisions as had been imported into these contracts. It was in the interest of the industry of the whole community that such a state of things should not exist. If the Bill were to pass in its present form there were points which some of his friends and himself thought were not covered by Clause 16, and if some of the other clauses were not amended the position would be intolerable. He appealed to his right hon. friend to exercise all the ingenuity in his power to defeat what seemed to be a protectionist conspiracy to utilise the open door and the generous hearts of a free trade country, and to endeavour to secure equal opportunity for the development of a great industry so far as it depended on the free use of inventions, whether of this country or abroad, to all men who carried on their business in this country.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) hoped he would not disturb the harmony which had been the feature of the discussion of the Bill that afternoon, by commenting on one or two remarks that had fallen from the hon. Member who opened the discussion. The hon. Member had assured them that many goods were sold more cheaply in Germany than in this country. His only comment on that was that it was a remarkable admission for a free trader and a member of the Free Trade Party to make in the House of Commons. He understood that one of the great planks of the free trade platform was that everything was sold more dearly in a protectionist than in a free trade country. Apparently however the hon. Member did not share the views of the great majority of his Party. The hon. Member went on to say that the House in passing this Bill would be saying in effect to the inventor, "We are giving you protection and we expect the country to obtain some advantage thereby." He quite agreed with the hon. Member, and he only hoped that at some future date the House in passing a fuller measure of protection would say the same thing to the manufacturers of this country. He thought the hon. Gentleman, if it was not impertinent to say so, had spoilt an otherwise excellent speech by the remarks he had made use of at the end in which he said this Bill had nothing whatever to do with fiscal reform, and he could not help thinking of the words used by the present Secretary of State for India in 1900 when he said—

> "In this era of militarism which they promise us, domestic reform, constitutional, fiscal, or any other reform, will be very slow in coming, but real and deep danger is the loss of our industrial supremacy. Great rivals are springing up against us in all the markets of the world."

He did not treat any kind of fiscal reform as one would treat the plague, as the hon. Member who opened this discussion appeared to treat it. Then he thought they on that side of the House had listened with great interest to the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Northamptonshire, and although he did not intend to follow him into all his arguments about the state of the boot trade in Northamptonshire, he could not help thinking that that was rather a doleful afternoon for the free importers, because first they had the Member for Prestwich telling them that goods were sold more cheaply in Germany than in this country, and then they had the hon. Member for East Northants giving a doleful picture of the state of the boot trade in Northamptonshire and the way in which our American rivals had got the better of us. He did not wish to turn the debate into a free trade and protectionist discussion; he only desired to make a suggestion with regard to Clause 2 to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. His hon. friend the Member for the Kingston Division of Surrey objected to Clause 2 on the ground that it might inflict hardship on the poor inventor. He was not sure that he agreed with his hon. friend. It appeared to him that there could be no objection to Clause 2 if the right hon. Gentleman gave to the Comptroller full discretion in the matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: He has got it already.

*VISCOUNT TURNOUR said he had not seen it. If the Comptroller had discretion, it was discretion of a very limited character. His suggestion was that the Comptroller should be given an unfettered discretion in these matters, because he thought that would get over the difficulty which hon. Members on both sides of the House felt. The only other point he wished to refer to was on Clause 10. It was with diffidence that he made the remark, but it seemed to him that the effect of the clause would be to throw on the Comptroller the onus of defining the meaning of a treaty, with, of course, an appeal to the Judge. He believed that in previous Bills introduced into the House to amend the patent laws the promoters had been very careful to avoid putting that onus upon either the Comptroller or the Judge. In his opinion it made it rather dangerous if it was intended to give this power to the Comptroller or the Judge, but no doubt the right hon. Member had good reason for putting what he had into the Bill. He hoped the Bill would pass through all its stages very quickly and become law, and that it would remove one of the many unfair restrictions from which inventors and manufacturers in this country suffered at the present moment. If it was not impertinent to do so he would like to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on, he would not say the first, but one of the first steps which he had taken in the direction of protection.

MR. MOND (Chester) said the Bill made inroads on the rights of patentees in a manner which, he thought, was scarcely realised. He did not think there was any necessity to reply to the noble Lord opposite. The fact that certain goods might be produced more cheaply in a protectionist country, the general fiscal system of the country not being the only consideration in the case, was too elementary to be discussed. To his mind the Bill was in no way a step in the direction of protection. He wished to draw attention to Clause 9, which, as at present drafted, would lead to the curious result that part of the procedure under it would have to take place before the Comptroller and part before a Judge; that was to say, if it was desired to revoke a patent on some grounds, application would have to be made to the High Court, while, if certain other grounds were taken, the application would have to be made to the Comptroller, so that there would have to be two petitions floating at the same time. It was admitted that inventors were the most poorly-paid people in the country. What was really the grievance of members of the boot trade? They seemed to have entered into some imprudent arrangement, and now came and asked the House for a Bill to cancel that arrangement and to alter the law in a very important particular in order that they might get out of an unprofitable contract. Clause 16 referred to the avoidance of certain conditions attached to the sale of patented articles. A patented article in this Bill was defined as an article made by a patent process. A man made a bleaching powder with a patent, and another made it without a patent. Supposing the latter made a contract with a customer to sell to him for ten years, that contract was not included in the provision. But supposing the man who manufactured by a patented process made a similar contract, it could at any moment be cancelled as being void in law. He submitted with very great diffidence whether that was not the right interpretation of the very complicated language of Clause 16. It was a point to which he seriously drew the attention of his right hon. friend. Under the clause an article made under a process which happened to be patented thereby became a patented article. That might not be the intention of Clause 16, but the clause as it now stood was very dangerous indeed. An industry should not have more hardships placed upon it without very serious deliberation, and they ought not to interfere with the right of contract between business people exercised in a business way. Another important point was as to the compulsory working clauses. A great many people were very enthusiastic about the compulsory working clauses. He had some experience of similar clauses abroad, and he did not flatter himself that they would be any more effective here than they had been elsewhere. Their effect abroad had been absolutely *nil*. He had taken the trouble to look up both the French and the German compulsory working clauses, which provided that where the inventor did not make efforts for the working of his invention in two years, or did not work it for two consecutive years, he lost the right to his patent. Surely, it ought to be that somebody should be allowed to continue the monopoly and right to the patent, if the patentee did not exercise it in his country, or refused to grant reasonable licences to somebody else. If he exercised the right in some other country that seemed to him to be a point quite apart, and one which seriously conflicted with Section 5 of the Convention of 1883. As far as he could see, the clause as now drafted seriously contravened that Convention; and it appeared to him that the Patent Office, already overworked, in making an order would have to study every Convention to find out whether the order affected any one of the Conventions. He was an English patentee, and he carried on his manufacture in Sweden because of the water power obtained there; consequently he would be robbed of the benefit of his invention as far as England was concerned. The Bill took away the right of the patentee to go to the House of Lords on a question of the revocation of a patent. After all, patents were very valuable property, and why should the patentee, less than any other subject in England who had the right to go to the highest Court of Appeal, be under the control of one Judge, and debarred from taking his appeal to the House of Lords in order to get a decision on a point which might involve millions of money? He could understand its being done with the idea of saving expense, but patents which were worth anything were, as a rule, worth spending money upon. He thought that the powers of the Comptroller would really have to be altered, and if his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade could see his way to constitute, once and for all, a competent Court to deal with patent cases, he would confer one of the greatest boons on inventors, patentees, and commercial men, and he was sure it would save an enormous amount of money. At that stage of the Bill he would not go into further technical points. He thought the Bill could very well be referred to a Committee; but he hoped that the points he had raised would be very carefully considered, and that they would have, when the Bill was passed, something which would approach finality. They all knew that people connected with patents found it very difficult to understand the patent laws of the country, which were very expensive and discouraging. He hoped that some of the suggestions thrown out by the hon. and learned Member opposite would be carried out, and that on the Committee stage of the Bill the Government would carefully consider, as he had no doubt they would, the Amendments which would be placed before them by experts who had devoted the best part of their lives to the subject.

*Mr. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said that anyone familiar with the working of the patent system had recognised the necessity of legislation along the lines of this Bill. In any legislation dealing with the relation of home and foreign patents it was necessary to bear in mind that we could not differentiate as against foreigners, because, by the International Convention of 1883, the subjects of States which were parties to that Convention, were to be treated on the same basis as our own people. With reference to the actual proposals of the Bill, he thought that a great deal was to be said in favour of the requirement, as regards certain chemical patents, that the Board of Trade should have power to require samples to be deposited. This would do a very considerable amount towards lessening the evils which arose from what were commonly called "paper anticipations." There was a difficulty which he was bound to point out, and it was that the Bill proposed that samples might be required to be deposited not merely with a complete specification, but also with a provisional specification. The object of the provisional specification system was to enable the inventor to obtain priority of time and to develop his invention, which he described subsequently at length in his complete specification, and until he had developed his invention he might be seriously hampered if he had to deposit a sample with his provisional specification. The clause relating to restrictive conditions in the use of patented articles was of great importance. It had been all along the case that the patentee had been regarded as having the field entirely to himself, and that if people used his patent he could impose upon them any conditions he liked. The hardship of that was that where restrictive conditions were imposed, and there was a breach of those conditions, it was treated by the Court not as a breach of contract, but as an infringement of the patent, and the whole system of injunction was brought to bear to strengthen the patentee in his position, which was a far stronger and more exclusive one than it was intended by the law to give him. He was glad that this Clause 16, which had been so much discussed, had been put into the Bill. He would suggest one Amendment for the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman. The clause dealt only with the restrictions as regarded the use of an article by persons engaged in a trade or industry. It seemed to him that this was a highly undesirable limitation, and that there should be an end once and for all of these restrictive conditions as regards the use of patented articles, whether they were used in the case of a trade or industry, or in the ordinary course of daily life. He suggested that these words of limitation which limited the effect of the clause to articles used in trade or industry should be struck out. Clause 10 seemed to be one of the most important in the Bill, but he doubted whether he could support it as it stood. It referred to the revocation of patents worked outside the United Kingdom. He did not put his objection to the clause on the ground of free trade or protection, because that question did not really come in, as patents were certainly not questions of free trade or protection but monopolies, which were necessary to protect inventors and experimenters in the result of their labours. Therefore as it was not a matter of free trade or protection he proposed to discuss it on other lines. In the first place, he would like to consider what would be the effect in this country. A large number of foreign inventions were brought over to this country. He instanced the case of typewriting machines from the United States. Those machines were sold here at about the same prices as in the United States. Had they any quarrel with that? If this clause were put into operation it might lead to certain parts of these American typewriting machines being made in this country, but it would increase the cost of production and the price of these articles to the general public. He ventured to think that very grave difficulties would arise under this clause in regard to articles manufactured exclusively or mainly outside the United Kingdom. He did not know what "mainly outside" meant, and probably they would require a long series of legal decisions to find out. The great difficulty which the inventor had to face was obtaining capital to work his invention. He was very much afraid that if this clause became law they would find powerful syndicates attempting to freeze out poor inventors by threatening that unless they sold their patents at breaking-up prices they would take steps for an action for revocation. Those considerations weakened the argument in favour of Clause 10. He thought the object of that clause could be met sufficiently by a satisfactory system of compulsory licences. He wished to congratulate the President of the Board of Trade on the changes he proposed to introduce in regard to compulsory licences in giving those who sought them an easier, cheaper, and more rapid tribunal than the Privy Council. That would in itself almost be enough. There was another thing which would do a great deal in the same direction, and he would commend it to his right hon. friend. As all those familiar with patent law actions knew, anyone bringing an action for infringement generally went for an injunction, and if an infringement was established an injunction was granted as a matter of course. In almost all other patent cases an injunction was looked upon as an exceptional remedy, and it was never granted unless the ordinary remedies would be inadequate. The Judges several centuries ago, in the reign of James I., treated the infringement of a patent as a contempt of the Royal prerogative upon which the patent was founded, and it was dealt with by the Star Chamber. The Star Chamber had long disappeared, but the injunction was still wielded by the Courts in the same wholesale fashion. He suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that the law should be altered in such a manner that an injunction should not be granted unless, for one thing, it could be shown that ordinary remedies would not meet the case. If this question of injunction were dealt with it would be an important contribution towards what they all desired. Supplemented by that, he thought the system of compulsory licences which was now proposed would effect the desired end. He was glad to see that the Government were dealing with several matters with reference to designs and were laying it down that no designs were to be marked as registered except where there was a subsisting copyright. He would like to go a step further. At present an article might be marked as registered just before the copyright expired. It seemed to him highly desirable that when any person marked a design as registered he should in addition give the year and the number of the registration. That would enable the public to verify the claim and to find out in a simple manner how long a design had still to run. The same arguments applied to the case of patents. He thought it was a rather serious oversight in the Government Bill that the provision which applied to designs did not apply to patents. Section 105 of the Act of 1883 applied to both patents and designs. As the law stood, people could not mark an article as patented unless the patent had been granted; but once granted, they could go on marking it patented after the patent had expired. It would be a very good thing if this were so amended as to restrict the marking of any article as patented to an article which was covered by a subsisting patent, and when the patent expired, the right to mark an article as patented ought to cease. In all patents the date and number ought to be given as part of the marking, because without that information it was often impossible to find what particular patent was referred to. A typewriting machine might be marked as patented, although the only thing covered by the patent might be some simple adjustment for the ribbon. There was a patent case in the House of Lords not long ago concerning a bottle containing mineral water, ginger ale, which had been marked as patented. The patent did not refer to the bottle, which was of a common type, or to the liquid which, he might add, was well known to a large number of Members of the House. What was referred to was a part of the machinery used in aerating the liquid. How was it possible to find out under the present system what the patent really was? Therefore he thought anyone who marked an article as patented should be required to give the date and number in order that the public might be able without much trouble to ascertain its duration and scope. For many years we had treated the term "true and first inventor" as covering a person who imported an invention from a foreign country. The importation of inventions which the importer had come across abroad was a thing of the past, and the effect of that arrangement now was that a person abroad, instead of acting as a British applicant and making the required declaration as to his being the true and first inventor, had the alternative of communicating it to an agent in this country, who could then obtain a patent in his own name for the invention as a "communicated" one, and it had been held repeatedly that in the case of a "communicated," invention no inquiry could be made as to the circumstances under which the communicated invention had been obtained. In the result, if anyone stole an invention, and tried to patent it in the ordinary way, he would very rightly be defeated. But if he crossed the Channel and posted it to an agent, the agent could obtain in his own name a patent for it which could not be challenged on the ground of theft. He hoped that his hon. friends would not think that he was showing people how to steal patents. What was contrary to public morals was not calling the attention of the House to the evil, but the fact that the evil existed. He hoped that when the Bill went into Committee that evil might be removed, and that they might put applications from abroad on precisely the same level in respect of the requirements as to good faith and originality as applications from people in this country. He considered that a patent should not be granted unless the applicant, or one of the applicants, made the ordinary declaration that he believed himself to be the true and first inventor, and that the patent should be upset if a false declaration had been made. He had risen to commend the Bill, and hoped that his right hon. friend would not look upon him as a sort of inverted Balaam because he had tried to temper his commendation with suggestions for improvement. He congratulated his right hon. friend on the way in which he had undertaken the important and difficult task of reforming the patent laws and hoped that the measure would have the happy result of promoting the industrial development of the country.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said that as this question was regarded as one of the greatest importance in the large manufacturing city which he represented, he would like to say a few words upon it. He congratulated the President of the Board of Trade upon dealing by an amending Bill with the present unsatisfactory state of the patent laws. He rejoiced that the right hon. Gentleman had not been frightened by the absurd cry of protection. The debate upon this and other Bills would be simplified if Liberal Members would cease to describe themselves as free traders. They were nothing of the kind. They were simply free importers. He had always been for free trade, but we had not got it. It mystified the question when undue and misleading terms were used. The Bill was designed to secure, not protection but fair play for British traders against the unfair competition of foreigners. The hon. Member for East Northamptonshire seemed to have protection on the brain. The hon. Gentleman's speech satisfied the Opposition completely in the direction of protection as they understood it. Nothing could be more satisfactory to them than the principles the hon. Member had laid down. The hon. Member for Kingston had made an important speech, and he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would give careful attention to the suggestions which he had made. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman was alive to the importance of sparing the inventor, and especially the poor inventor, unnecessary expense in connection with legal proceedings. The poor inventor, when opposed by a rich rival, or by a syndicate, often had not only his purse but his heart broken. He hoped the Government would adhere to Clause 10 of the Bill, which required that articles patented should be manufactured largely, if not exclusively, in this country. If the British Government gave a man a monopoly to supply 42,000,000 of people in this country with a particular article, that man should be compelled to manufacture a large proportion, if not all of them here, so as to employ British labour in their production. That was absolutely fair. If that was protection, all who supported the Bill were protectionists. It would be advantageous if the Government would define more clearly than was done in the Bill what proportion of patented goods should be made in this country, so as to insure that the proportion was substantial. From the point of view of the British inventor and the British workman the arguments of the hon. Member for Chester were unsound, and he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would resist any blandishments as to alleged protection or anything else, and keep in view what would be fair to British inventors, traders, and workmen. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman upon taking this long-delayed amendment of the law in hand, and was confident that the ramifications of its benefits would extend to inventors, commercial men, and workmen. The inventor too often had the advantages which would reward his genius and inventive capacity filched from him by the power of gold. He hoped Parliament would protect the individual against that power.

*Mr. ASTBURY (Lancashire, Southport) said that the hon. Member for the Kingston Division had raised a number of points which were deserving of consideration. The main object of the Bill so far as policy was concerned was contained substantially in the two clauses which provided for compulsory working and compulsory licenses; and so far as those two clauses were concerned, with the exception of some possible criticism as to the Court before which these matters were to come, he was of opinion that they supplied a long-needed want in connection with the great industries of the country. It was an extraordinary thing that from a land where Perkins' Mauve was invented, the colour industry should have passed to a foreign country, and that the country which produced the electro-magnet and the induction coil should have been passed by other countries in the race for the discovery, application, and completion of electrical inventions. He believed that very largely the reason for this was to be found in our patent system and its administration. Surely the object of our patent laws ought to be in the first place to encourage invention as far as possible, in order that scientific research and people who were acquainted with science should be more encouraged in the country and be induced to take more part in developing our industries. The next object, however, was that the monopoly given by a patent should be a monopoly which should be confined to carrying out the intention of the original framers of the Statute of Monopolies, that it should be subservient to the purpose of introducing and working these patented inventions in this country. At present the industries of this country were largely handicapped by the fact that patents could be obtained with great facility by foreign firms and rich corporations, and many minor patents could be taken out subsequent to the main invention, with the result that, having regard to the great expense of patent litigation, be the patents good or bad, 99 out of 100 of the small traders of the country could not suffer the expense of fighting these great foreign corporations and the inventions remained for years unworked here. He wished to add his testimony to the courage and ability of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill in taking up a subject which not only bristled with difficulty but on which there was an enormous difference of opinion. The question of compulsory working had two sides, and there were a large number of people in the country, many of them well qualified to speak, who were bitterly opposed to the notion that we should improve our position by putting the compulsory clause into operation. He was not one of those. He believed that the monopoly which the Crown granted to an inventor ought *prima facie* to be a monopoly which should be given to and utilised for the benefit of our own industries and our own land. It was said that if that were done it would be a hardship upon the English patentee. He had heard from the hon. Member for Chester and others outside the House that if patents could be revoked because they were only worked outside the country many English inventors who had facilities for working abroad and not at home would be deprived of their patents. The first answer to that was that they were absolutely negligible in number; and, secondly, that if that was the case they ought to be deprived of their grants on the same grounds as a foreigner, if the main object was that the industries of this country should benefit from the monopoly granted. He was far from saying that the Bill entirely carried out the object which the right hon. Gentleman had, but he knew from the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had met the views of many who had seen him that he was only too anxious in Committee that any further improvements that could be suggested in this respect should be adopted. With regard to compulsory licences, there was a class of people who believed that the right way to effect what they desired was by way of compulsory licences rather than by way of compulsory working. His own view was that that was wrong. The right view, as it seemed to him, was that the best results would be obtained by a combination of the two remedies, because there was a vast difference between enforcing compulsory licences—after litigation and after difficulties which must arise in the case of a complicated invention—and the simple expedient which said that if the monopoly was granted and it turned out that at the end of three years this country had not benefited from it as it should that monopoly should cease. With regard to compulsory licences, a question had been raised with regard to the so-called unreasonable contracts which were said to have become a practice chiefly in the boot trade. He did not think the House ought to be asked to say that Clause 16 should be made retrospective. It was hardly in accordance with sound administration that the House should lay down that a large number of existing contracts should be made void. But so far as he could judge from the provisions of Clause 11, any person who was unable to obtain a licence except on terms which were unreasonable or injurious to trade could apply for and obtain a compulsory licence, and if the terms suggested in the contracts mentioned were of the character described the remedy for those who were bound by such existing contracts was to be found under Clause 11. With regard to the machinery of the Bill, under the Designs part of it there was a matter he desired to refer to which was of very great moment to Lancashire, and in which he believed most Lancashire Members took a great interest. More than 50 per cent. of the total designs registered in this country every year were textile designs under the last two classes in the Designs Act; in 1905 the House, in the Trade Marks Amendment Act, established a separate system of cotton marks with a keeper or registrar of those marks in Lancashire who was conversant with the requirements of the firms interested in these matters. The proportion that cotton marks bore to the total trade marks of the country was nothing like so large as the proportion which textile designs bore to designs as a whole. Textile designs were of two classes, either printed or woven, and every year there were registered 10,000 textile designs, of which 7,000 were printed designs. Of these 7,000, more than 6,000 were registered from Manchester, and more than half of the woven designs were from that centre. The universal desire in the textile industries was that there should be a branch registry for textile designs established in Manchester, on the same lines as was done in the case of cotton marks. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill in Committee would allow a clause to be added to the Bill with that object. There was also another matter which he regarded as very important in the administration of the law and the clauses of this Bill in relation to patents. The hon. Member for Kingston had suggested with great force that this very difficult and constantly increasing matter of scientific litigation should now be placed in the hands of a tribunal which was especially conversant with the matters it would have to deal with, and designed for that purpose. The Bill as drawn provided that certain matters on appeal from the Comptroller of Patents should be taken to a Judge nominated by the Lord Chancellor, rather than to the law officers of the Crown. Their duties with regard to patents were really almost intolerable at the present time, and if the Bill passed in its present form the number of appeals would be quadrupled or more, making it quite impossible for the law officers to attempt to deal with them. He suggested that there should be established a scientific or patent and trade marks division of the High Court in the same way as there was established an Admiralty Division. Cases in the Admiralty Division were tried with great facility and dispatch, because of the constant practice there and the continuity in the administration of the law and in its interpretation. Some similar Court for scientific industrial matters would be a great step forward and a necessary step, if full advantage was to be obtained from the objects and provisions of this Bill. But he did not think that it would be desirable that one permanent Judge should be appointed to that Court. He agreed entirely with the hon. and learned Member for Kingston, and for this reason, that it was undesirable in these scientific matters that the law and its administration should get stereotyped and cramped. They wanted the elasticity of different minds coming to these matters from time to time, and if a Division could be established and a Judge nominated to sit in it annually by the Lord Chancellor, it would mark a very great step forward in the administration of our patent laws. If that were done, that Judge, sitting in Chambers, could take all the matters that the law officers at present took, and the same people would have the same right of audience before him when exercising this jurisdiction. It was considered very undesirable by many who were acquainted with the administration of the patent law that the Comptroller should have extended powers, such as were suggested in Clause 6, of refusing the original grant of a patent. He suggested that there the law should remain as it was, and that under Clause 9 the Comptroller should not have power to revoke any patent except on the grounds on which at the present time he could refuse the original grant. He would suggest further that the questions under Clause 10 should go before a Judge of the High Court, and not before the Comptroller. It would be a most delicate and difficult jurisdiction to administer, and he believed it would be cheaper and much more efficient in the long run that these matters should go, in the first instance, before a Judge of the High Court instead of before the Comptroller.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth) said he rose in no spirit of opposition to the Bill. There was so much that he thought good in it that he desired not to obstruct it but to help it forward and make it as effective as possible. He saw, in looking through the Bill, that there was no provision for extending the period of protection to the patentee, and he urged that something should be done in that direction. He was quite aware that a patentee could apply to the Court for such an extension, but he had no guarantee that he would get it. That bore very hardly, especially on the poor patentee with no great weight of capital with which to bring his invention forward. It took some time to perfect his invention, and a considerable time to bring it before the public, and just about the time when it began to pay, his patent lapsed and somebody else got the benefit of his brains, energy, and enterprise. The benefits accruing from the inventor's brains, energy and enterprise should, however, be secured to him, and he asked the President of the Board of Trade to consider whether it would be possible to introduce a clause increasing the facilities for, and reducing the cost of, obtaining an extended period of protection.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) thought the Government had every reason to be satisfied with the reception accorded to the Bill in the course of the discussion. There had been substantially no criticism of any leading principle of the Bill. The criticism had been directed against points of detail—very important points, no doubt, but all points which, he thought, could be successfully attended to without in any way destroying the general structure of the measure. He might say, for his part, that he would welcome any suggestions in Committee, and no pride of paternity would prevent him from giving them favourable consideration so long as the leading principle of the Bill was not altogether exterminated. He would refer to only two or three leading points that had been raised in the course of the debate. As to the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member for Handsworth, it seemed to be fair, under the circumstances he had mentioned, that they should have, at any rate, the power to apply to some tribunal to grant an extension of the patentee's monopoly and privilege. The patentee could now, under Section 25 of the Consolidating Act, apply to the Privy Council. The only criticism that might be passed on that process was that it was a very expensive tribunal, and he was prepared to consider whether it was possible to simplify and cheapen the method of applying for an extension under these circumstances. They wanted, if it were possible, to cheapen the whole process. At the present moment it was almost prohibitive, and it was certainly prohibitive for the poor inventor, who was either denied justice altogether or compelled to part with his patent to the first capitalist that came along. That was a very unfortunate state of things. He was glad to observe that legal gentlemen inside and outside the

House showed for the poor inventor a keen anxiety which was very creditable, and he was very glad to see that the hon. Member for Chester had also joined them. He desired to say, before he proceeded to any of the other criticisms, how much he thanked his hon. and learned friend the Member for Southport, than whom there was no higher authority, either inside the House or out of it, on these matters, not only for the suggestions he had made that afternoon, but also for the very great assistance he rendered to him before he introduced the Bill. The noble Lord the Member for Horsham had suggested that they should not make the deposit of samples under Clause 2 compulsory in all cases. As a matter of fact, that was provided for already. It was never intended that every patentee of a chemical invention should be compelled to deposit samples. It was left entirely in the discretion of the Registrar, and the provision was much more elastic than the German regulations in that respect. Clause 6, which had been criticised, was entirely in the interests of the inventor. It was intended to cover a case of this kind. They might have an application for a patent which had not been covered by any previous grant. It was, however, thoroughly well known that it was a process in respect of which a patent had been issued in another country and full particulars of which had been published in this country. But, although that was known to all the parties, it could not be referred to in the hearing before the Comptroller, and the result was that the Comptroller was obliged to grant a patent which was in itself an invalid patent, and when they came to the subsequent hearing before the Court, the whole grant had to be revoked. It would be better if, in the first instance, a patent of that kind could be alluded to, and that the Comptroller should have discretion, in a clear case of that sort, to refuse a patent. The present system was simply a premium on litigation.

Sir E. CARSON (Dublin University) asked whether the appeal in that case would go to the law officers or to the Judge.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said his own interpretation was that it would go before

Mr. Lloyd-George.

the law officers; but he was prepared favourably to consider the suggestion which had been thrown out that it would be far better if the whole of the appeals were taken before the special Judge who was to be allocated to this purpose. He might say that it was rather his intention, even before the debate of that afternoon, to introduce an Amendment to that effect in the Bill. He thought it would be an improvement. With regard to Clause 10, there again the criticism had not been directed against the principle. The hon. Member for Merthyr had put down an Amendment, and then, very characteristically, if he might say so, having seen it well advertised in the Press, ran away from it. He was not at all surprised, because he knew his hon. friend pretty well. But apart from this firing at a long distance there had been no hostile criticism. The hon. Member for Chester brushed aside at once very effectively the suggestion that this had anything whatever to do with the merits of the great fiscal controversy. Therefore he would not go into that, as he had not been challenged. All the criticisms against Section 10 had been criticisms upon points of detail. Those would be threshed out in Committee, and he did not think it would serve any useful purpose for him now to give a final answer to suggestions which had been thrown out, and which he had to consider very carefully, because he agreed with the hon. Member for Southport that this was a very difficult problem altogether. Then he came to the point with regard to the allocation of a special Judge. He was not at all surprised that the hon. Member for Richmond did not agree altogether upon that, because it would be a very serious thing if they had a Judge who was not quite adapted to the work—and accidents of that kind had happened—a Judge who would be set up in a kind of special statutory Court, and who could not well be moved. The point would be considered very carefully; but they had felt that on the whole the best plan was to proceed experimentally, and to get a special Judge assigned for the purpose. Of course he could see the advantage of it. If they went to different Judges to try patent cases, they had to waste an enormous amount of time in explaining to them the very elements which a Judge trying these things constantly would take for granted. Having a special Judge they would save time, and that meant saving expense. He was sure they would save at least two-thirds of the time spent on these cases if they had a Judge specially versed in them. They proposed, therefore, to start by allocating a Judge especically for the purpose, and he was not sure that something might not be done during the Committee stage in the way of altering the rules and things of that kind, which would in effect set up a special Court, without doing it in so many words. Now he came to the important question which had been raised with regard to Clause 16—the avoidance of certain conditions attached to the sale, etc., of patented articles. It was no secret that that was put in very largely owing to the remarkable character of the contract which was forced upon the boot and shoe industry by an American firm. Nine-tenths of the boot and shoe manufacturers of this country were practically bound hand and foot by that contract. It would be a very serious matter if another invention was to come in, effecting a great saving of time and expense, and they could not take advantage of it, for they might be beaten out of the market altogether. That was a state of things which they could not possibly contemplate, and it made no difference at all whether the firm was British or American. After all, a patent was a privilege granted by the Crown, and Parliament had a right to declare the conditions under which the monopoly should be granted. He had been pressed to make the clause retrospective, but it was a very serious thing to introduce into an Act of Parliament a provision which would invalidate contracts, and nothing but a great public necessity would justify it. In this case he did not think it ought to be done, except under conditions which would protect the inventor as well. The possessor of these patents had entered into a large number of contracts with manufacturers, and no doubt when he came to settle the terms upon which he let his machines be made he would take into account the security which that contract gave him for a good many years to come. It was an asset. He might have raised a considerable amount of capital, and if he knew that the contract he was entering into was void, he probably would have asked for a bigger royalty, and at any rate he was entitled to reconsider his position with those who entered into the contract with him. After all, they must be fair to all parties. He was not sure that, if they said that certain clauses in a contract should be void, it would be quite fair to future purchasers of that machine. When the syndicate owning the patent knew that they could not enter into a similar contract they might say that in future they would demand a higher royalty. It would be unfair to those who entered into contracts in future if they had to pay more for the machine than those who had entered into the contract already and had been liberated by Act of Parliament. He agreed that something ought to be done. His hon. and learned friend thought that Clause 11 met the case, but he was not sure that it met the whole case, and he was prepared to consider any Amendments that might be moved to meet it so long as those contracts were invalidated under conditions which would be perfectly fair to both parties. In regard to a special office in Manchester, though he could not at present give a pledge, he rather thought they would be able to meet the case. It would be a great convenience to the Manchester manufacturers to be able on the spot to examine the designs instead of coming up to London. He would consider it very fully, and he thought it could be accomplished. He had now dealt with nearly all the criticisms passed on the Bill, including those of the hon. Member for Bordesley. He agreed with the right hon. Member that what they wanted was fair play and justice to British industries. [Sir Howard Vincent: Hear, hear.] He thought that would appeal to the hon. and gallant Gentleman. At present some of the powerful foreign trusts were able to bring pressure to bear, by their great financial resources, to prevent *bona fide* inventions taking root in this country to begin with. They crushed them in their infancy by legal action. It was a case where they practically drove some branches of British industry out of the field altogether, as it were, because they were never allowed to start at all. He trusted that when this Bill was passed they would be able to put an end to that practice for ever.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich) said that, as the only Member on the Opposition side of the House who had been connected with the Board of Trade, he naturally followed closely measures which came from that Department. On personal grounds he had legitimate cause of grievance against the President of the Board of Trade. It was the duty of the Opposition to oppose, and his colleagues had no reason to complain that their activity in that respect had been interfered with by the members of the Government. His colleagues had opposed, and had enjoyed their opposition. He also would have enjoyed opposing, but he had not had the opportunity, for hitherto he had only been able to play the very uninteresting *rôle* of supporting the measures brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman. That really pointed to what was a recognised fact, that trade questions were not in any sense Party questions; and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would admit that from the Opposition he had received not only no factious obstruction on trade questions, but a measure of support which was not usual. In regard to this Bill, he entirely approved of the objects which the right hon. Gentleman aimed at, and to a very large extent of the methods by which he intended to carry them out. In regard to the Court before which these patent cases were to be tried there was a good deal to be said for the view of the hon. Member for Chester. The issues involved in these cases were often enormously large, they could be taken from one Court to another, and it seemed unfit that a question that involved millions should be finally settled by one Judge. But in all these cases there was a balance of advantage and disadvantage, and personally he thought the balance of advantage on the whole distinctly was that the cost of securing patents should be made as low as possible. Therefore, it was at least worth while trying to have such cases tried before one Judge, who, as the right hon. Gentleman had promised, would be specially devoted to the work and specially competent to develop it. The second point to which he wished to refer was that mentioned in Clause 2 of the Bill, which had relation to the conditions on which patents for chemicals were to be granted in future. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly just to his noble friend on this point. He did not think the Bill, as it at present stood, gave the protection which the right hon. Gentleman thought it gave. What ought to be done was to give the Comptroller power, provisionally at least, to grant protection long enough to enable the inventor to secure sufficient financial support from capitalists. As the right hon. Gentleman had pointed out in introducing the Bill, Germany had practically a monopoly in many branches of the chemical industry. Where that monopoly was due to superior methods, there was no ground for complaint. It was the fair spoil of Germany's bow and spear. But, however obtained, that monopoly had been confirmed and strengthened by this country's patent laws. They had this effect—that a syndicate or large capitalist would take out a patent to cover much ground without working it at all. Therefore, inventors were prevented from going in that direction at all. In Germany the patentee was not allowed to cover the same amount of ground, and, therefore, the field was left much more open to competition. We should adopt the same system in this country. As to the clause preventing contracts similar to those which now prevailed in the boot trade in this country, he admitted that it was a strong measure to interfere with contracts deliberately entered into by business men who knew what they were doing. But these contracts were in a special position. The man who made these conditions was only able to make them by means of the special privilege given by our laws; and, therefore, it was reasonable to take care that that especial privilege was not used detrimentally to the interests of this country. But he agreed that it would be unfair to make the clause retrospective, and it seemed to go further than was necessary to meet such cases. If that were true, and if he was right in his view, the industries affected would certainly make representations to the Board of Trade, and he was sure that the Department would give them every consideration. The only other point in the Bill was as to compulsory working. The right hon. Gentleman showed that he was disappointed that the hon. Member for Merthyr had not brought forward his Amendment, but if the President of the Board of Trade was disappointed, he himself was much more disappointed. If the President of the Board of Trade had not made an epoch-making invention, he had certainly become the apostle of a new faith on the other side of the House. He had looked forward in this debate to something in the nature of a heresy-hunt; and it would have been very interesting if the hon. Member for Merthyr had persisted, for a heresy, to be effective, must come from one's own household. With the best will in the world towards the right hon. Gentleman, he was bound to say that he could not see his way to defend him against the hon. Member for Merthyr, for in this matter the right hon. Gentleman was undoubtedly a heretic. This was essentially a Bill that sapped the whole theory on which our present fiscal system rested. What was the root theory of our present fiscal system? That it was our interest to get any products consumed in this country from any quarter of the world where they were produced to the best advantage, without regard to whether or not they were produced in this country. The right hon. Gentleman said that a patent was entirely different; that it was a monopoly, and that we had a right in granting the monopoly to see that it was used to the advantage of this country. That was true. But the question was not one of right. We had a right to put on an import duty if we thought it to our advantage. It was merely a question of interest. Apply that principle to a patented article. Leave it to the free play of economic forces, and what happened? The foreign patentee produced in this country if it paid him, and he produced abroad if it paid him. Let him produce abroad, and let us pay for it by those goods which we could produce with advantage here—since goods must always be paid for with goods. If that were sound theory, why compel the foreign patentee to produce here? There could be only one answer—that, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, it was in the interest of this country that these things should be produced at home. If that were so as regarded the question of principle, there was no difference whatever whether the result were produced in one way or another. If it were right to produce the result by patent laws, it was equally right to produce it by import duties. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that America alone had not insisted upon patents being worked in America. He felt sure that everyone in the House knew the reason for that, because it was perfectly obvious. When he was at the Board of Trade he happened to see a document which came from a member of the American Government dealing with the compulsory working of patents. This was the substance of what the writer said—"What is your object," asked the writer, "in having things compulsorily made? It is to get them made in the United States. What is the most effective way of securing that end? Why fool about with patent laws? If you want them made in the United States put on a duty, and the things will be made in the United States." The right hon. Gentleman's system, then, was more protective than the system of the United States, for he made the production in this country universal. The right hon. Gentleman really adopted the principle which insisted that the system should be applied not only to the articles which we were adapted to produce, but that the articles which we were not able to produce should be made in this country provided they were the objects of a patent. ["No."] For the views which he personally held on this question he had received the greatest possible encouragement from the present Government. That encouragement had come from two quarters. First, from the Secretary of State for War, who was supposed to represent high thinking in the Cabinet, although he did not know whether his colleagues in the Cabinet took that view. A few weeks ago the right hon. Gentleman made the curious statement that the law of free trade depended on circumstances; it was not applied at all times; it was a question of the conditions of the country that imposed it and the conditions of the country which wished to trade. That was an important admission. Let hon. Members cast their minds back to their election speeches at the general election. [Cries of "Order."] Was that too great an effort? Then let them try to imagine what those speeches would be like if subject to the condition laid down by the Secretary for War. They could not talk about the consumer paying the duty, nor about the universal advantages of free trade; and then he would like to hear a speech from the right hon. Gentleman and to enjoy the privilege of answering him. Secondly, the Opposition had received another encouragement from the President of the Board of Trade, who represented the practical spirit in the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had lived up to the precept of the Secretary for War. He had treated every Question in his department as being one of expediency; he had looked at every question and had dealt with it from its own point of view, and nothing else. What was the result? Last session the right hon. Gentleman passed a Bill, a beautiful Bill, which had the effect, and it was intended to have the effect, of protecting the shipping industry, not against foreign competition, but against unfair foreign competition, which was the only kind of protection the opponents of the Government had any sympathy with. Now in this Bill which the right hon. Gentleman was piloting through the House he had gone a long step further, for it undoubtedly, in principle, sapped the foundation on which the whole of our fiscal system was based. [MINISTERIAL Cries of "No, no."]

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said that in this Bill the Government were concerned about the general trade of the country, and they were dealing with the patent law, which was essentially a protectionist law, with sufficient and excellent excuse. It was necessary to give a particular kind of protection here in order to stimulate invention; and the fact was that the patent law was protectionist in a more severe degree than any tariff could possibly be, because it was practically prohibitive against the manufacture of certain things except under certain conditions. That being so, this Bill proposed to restrict the rights of monopolists whom the patent law had created; yet because the Government proposed to restrict the rights of monopoly they were told that they were deserting the cause of free trade.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Never mind that.

SIR W. ROBSON said the hon. Gentleman asked for an application of the free play of economic forces to patent articles; but patent articles were wholly withdrawn from the free play of such forces. That was one of the reasons why the Government had introduced these clauses. Under the existing law proprietors of foreign patents had attached as conditions in the exercise and use of inventions in this country certain very onerous terms, such as—

> "If you use our machine you can use no other for creating this particular commodity;"

and—

> "You shall not avail yourself of any other invention."

There might be a new device invented which would revolutionise the trade of the country, but many manufacturers were incapacitated from availing themselves of that invention. There was not only this prohibition of the free play of economic forces, but there was also a serious impediment to trade and invention, by the use to which a particular class of foreign monopolist had put his patent. It could not be said, therefore, that the Government were deserting the cause of free trade when they restricted the power of such a monopolist as that, and asked for a fairer latitude to be given to the trader who was obliged by law to go to that particular vendor for the machinery that he wanted. On one occasion he had seen an agreement which imposed restrictions on the British users of a particular class of machine. The contract was made for twenty years, though the period of the patent was for fourteen years only, so that the American inventor by that device had in effect secured a prolongation of his patent. It was clear, therefore, that this legislation of the Government made for more freedom and less protection.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said that he did not care what the Party supporting the Government called themselves as long as they brought in Bills like this, designed to assist the manufacturing industry of the country. He thought that the whole-hearted support of the Opposition should go out to the Government in their present effort, and he thanked the President of the Board of Trade for the great pains he had taken to master a difficult subject and to protect our inventors. Nothing could be more unfortunate in our manufacturing industry than to see how impossible it was for our inventors to derive profit from their inventions, especially in the case of men with restricted means. Any measure which simplified the patent law and secured to a man the product of his own invention was one to be approved. He was quite sure that the great mass of the people of Sheffield would be grateful to the President of the Board of Trade for the pains he had taken in regard to this matter.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said that as nearly all the things he had intended to say had been already said he had very little to trouble the House with. He did not propose to discuss whether Clause 10 was free trade or protection, but he wished to point out one or two important results of it. For the first time in this country there was going to be introduced what was known as compulsory working. That system had been tried in many countries abroad, but it had been abandoned as a failure where tried. There was no compulsory working in the United States nor in the Commonwealth of Australia. If manufacture or compulsory working of the patent was to be enforced in this country, he thought it would be a serious matter for the poor inventor. He would like to remind the House how far they had advanced since 1902. In that year a Conservative Government passed a Patents Act under which it was provided that if a manufactured article was manufactured mainly or exclusively outside the United Kingdom the patent might be revoked, but only in cases where the reasonable requirements of the public had not been satisfied. It was left for a Liberal Government in 1907 to bring forward a proposal, with the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bordesley division, that a patent should be revoked, although the demands of the public were satisfied, simply because the patented article was manufactured abroad, and he thought that was an advance which ought to be noted by the House. It was the habit of our Colonies periodically to go through our Statute-book and adopt those measures which they thought advantageous to themselves, and it was extremely likely, if this Bill became law, that in the course of a few years nearly all our Colonies would adopt it. Then in our Colonies a condition of the validity of a patent would be that the patented article should be manufactured in the Colony where it was granted. He did not know whether manufacturers here were prepared to face that contingency. It appeared to him to be a heavy responsibility to take. Further than that, foreign countries would retaliate by having an equivalent of Clause 10 in their patent laws. The result would be that every manufacturer who set out with the intention of supplying the world would have to be prepared to establish a factory in every British Colony and in every foreign country. That would involve a great addition to the cost of manufacture, and, of course, an enhancement of the price to the consumer. He doubted whether Clause 10 was well advised, and he hoped that it would receive further consideration. Clauses 6 and 9 afforded grounds for litigation which made him shudder, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman in the interest of the poor inventor to reconsider that matter. He had known poor inventors who had become rich as the result of their ingenuity and prudence, but he was satisfied that if Clauses 6 and 9 remained in the Bill in their present form, the fortunes which inventors had hitherto made would in future be transferred to rich corporations.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

Referring to the following instruction of which the hon. Member for Kingston had given notice, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert in the Bill provisions for establishing a special tribunal for the hearing of all actions and proceedings relating to patents"—

*MR. SPEAKER said: If by that the hon. Member intends the allocation of all patent matters to one particular Judge, that can be done under the Bill as it stands now, but if he goes beyond that, and intends to constitute a special division of the High Court of Justice to deal with patent matters, that would be beyond the scope of the Bill.

In reference to the following notices—

MR. WATSON RUTHERFORD: After Second Reading of Patents and Designs Bill, to move, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to insert provisions that the patent granted in the United Kingdom to or on trust for any foreigner as a communication from abroad shall be *ipso facto* determined on the determination of the patent in the foreigner's own country from any cause whatever.

LORD BALCARRES: After Second Reading of Patents and Designs Bill, to move, That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they consider the desirability of hearing counsel and examining witnesses with regard to Part II. of the Bill—

*MR. SPEAKER said: These instructions being mandatory are both out of order. No mandatory instructions can be given to a Committee of the Whole House, or to a Standing Committee.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he understood that the Bill did not give power to relegate all patent matters to a Judge. The present state of the law was that every application for a revocation was bound to go before a Judge. This Bill proposed to abolish that system and invest the Comptroller with power to deal with such cases. The instruction of which his hon. and learned friend had given notice was that there should be a Judge to whom all matters under this Bill should be referred. At present the Bill only gave the Judge power to deal with certain cases under the Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: An Amendment can be moved in the Committee Stage to transfer to a Judge those matters proposed to be sent to the Comptroller.

MR. CAVE said that what he desired was that the Committee should have power to consider the question of referring to a Judge, or a Division of the High Court, not only arising matters under this Bill, but all patent matters. While that was no doubt outside the clauses of the Bill, he thought it was within the general scope and intention of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is beyond the scope of the Bill which is to "amend the law relating to patents and designs." The hon. Member proposes to go beyond that.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.), in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, said he believed he was right in saying that of all the numerous Bills which had been introduced on this subject, only one went before a Standing Committee, and that no Bill had ever got any further than that stage. He hoped that a more fortunate fate awaited this Bill. The present measure differed a good deal from the Bills which had been introduced into the House each year from 1902 to 1905. It was a more far-reaching Bill than any of its predecessors, and, though it went much further, he hoped that it would meet with a better fate. It was founded upon the Report of a Select Committee over which he had presided last session. That Committee sat a great number of times and heard a great deal of evidence, and made a practically unanimous Report to the House. While previous Bills simply dealt with the addition of moisture to butter this Bill went much further. There had been, he regretted to say, a great deal of adulteration and "faking" of butter. In fact the present state of things was so critical that unless something was done very soon to prevent natural butter from being adulterated, the people of this country would have no choice but to eat adulterated or faked butter made either at home or abroad. Some of the evidence given before the Committee was of the most extraordinary nature, showing how it paid to adulterate butter. Mr. Butler, who represented the Wilts United Creamery Company of Devizes, stated that overtures had been made to him offering a process of adulteration which should not be open to detection, but which would increase their present profits by £5,000 a year. Further Mr. Butler said that his company in face of such competition must either themselves fake butter or close their creamery. In a case taken against the Bridgwater Creamery Company only recently, it was admitted that the profits made by adding lardine to butter were £5,650 in fifteen months. Such a state of things proved that there was a very real need for this Bill, which aimed at stopping the adulteration of butter at its source. Previous Bills were aimed at the seller or retailer; this measure went to the source. The innocent retailer was the man who first of all was shot at in previous Bills; he had to prove that he was innocent; he had to prove that it was through no fault of his own that the adulteration had taken place. Even if he did prove his innocence and was able to throw back the blame on the right person, yet he had all the trouble of proving his innocence. It was in the interest of the retailers of the country who were liable to be unjustly accused of adulterating their butter that adulteration should be stopped at its source. The principle of the Bill had been approved of by the producers of butter throughout the country. The Central Chamber of Agriculture had unanimously approved of the principle of the Bill, and he might say that practically the same attitude had been taken up by the Grocers' Federation and the Butter Association, while objecting to some of its provisions. The Nottingham District Association at first strongly objected to the Bill and asked its local Members to oppose it. After the provisions had been explained to the Association, they passed a Resolution rescinding a previous Resolution, and being now content with the Bill as it stood, they had asked their Members to support it. He would explain very shortly the clauses, for there had been a good deal of misunderstanding as to what was the real effect of the Bill. The first clause provided that the existing law as regarded the registration of margarine factories should be applied to butter factory premises for the manufacture of butter substitutes. The second subsection of the clause provided that in the case of imitation butters, or butter substitutes, a register should be kept as to where these were sent to. Sub-section 3, following out a recommendation made by the Select Committee, provided that no premises could be used as a butter factory which formed any part of or communicated with a margarine factory. It had been pointed out to him that in certain cases of creameries in Scotland they would be treated harshly under that particular provision because they might become butter factories. He thought that it might be possible to give exemption to those existing creameries in Scotland, under certain conditions, to be made by the Board of Agriculture on the ground that they had proved a great advantage to the farmers in the neighbourhood who sent their milk to these creameries. It had been represented to him that unless these exemptions were given, the alterations on the premises otherwise required would be so expensive that they would have to be shut up altogether. That proposal of his showed that they did not wish to deal harshly with such creameries. Clause 2, as to the inspection of factories by an officer of the Board of Agriculture was important. The powers of inspection of premises under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act would apply to factories for the manufacture of butter, margarine, margarine cheese, or other imitation butter. Provision was also made that officers duly authorised by the local authority, such as the medical officer, the sanitary inspector, or the inspector of weights and measures, or a police constable, to procure samples under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, might enter the premises used as a butter factory. That was a provision recommended by the Select Committee on the butter trade. No such power was proposed in the case of premises referred to in (b) of Sub-clause (1) of Clause 1, so that there might be no risk of revealing the trade secrets of these places. Sub-section 3 of Clause 2 was the only part of the Bill which applied to creameries and farm houses. That sub-section enabled the Board of Agriculture, where they had reason to suppose that an illegitimate business was being done, to send an officer with special authorisation to inspect the premises in order to see that no fraudulent trade was being carried on there. Clause 3 dealt with another recommendation of the Select Committee. An adulterant was produced by adding a certain amount of acid to milk, by which 8 lbs. of curd were obtained from 100 lbs. of milk at a cost of 7d. per lb. That curd could be used as a cheap adulterant. The object of this clause was to prevent any such curd, or oil, or fat capable of being used as an adulterant being brought into or kept in a butter factory. Clause 4, as indeed nearly all the other clauses in the Bill, was based on the unanimous recommendations of the Select Committee, and dealt with the limit of water permissible in factory butter and margarine, and other butter substitutes. No butter or margarine which contained more than 16 per cent. of water could be sent out of a butter or margarine factory. Valid objection had been taken to the wording of this clause, and it was proposed that it should be altered so as to make it plain that it applied only to the finished article which was packed and ready for consignment. The existing law in regard to farmhouse and creamery butter was not altered, either for Great Britain or Ireland.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked if the hon. Gentleman was aware that under the instructions of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland farmers in that country had actually been prosecuted for having in their possession butter containing more than 16 per cent. of water.

*Sir EDWARD STRACHEY said that those prosecutions must have taken place under regulations made under the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts, 1875 to 1899. It was a complete misapprehension that it was proposed to alter by this Bill the law in regard to farmhouse butter; the Bill as it stood did not alter the law in any respect as to farmhouse or creamery butter. It was only in the case of wilfully increasing the moisture himself that the farmer was liable to a penalty. Clause 8, which dealt with the sale of butter mixtures and imitation butter, was based upon the recommendations of the Select Committee. The sale of these substances, which met the wants and suited the tastes of certain sections of the public, was not prohibited, but precautions were taken that they were not sold under the name of butter. The description and name would have to be approved by the Board. They had no right to refuse permission to traders to deal in an article which was not subject to the objection that it was unwholesome, and the Committee's view was expressed in Paragraph 30 which he would read—

> "Your Committee think it would not be desirable to prohibit the manufacture or sale of the substance known as milk-blended butter, as it appears that this substance meets the wants or suits the tastes of a certain section of the community; but they consider that it is not butter; that it and other substances (not being margarine) containing butter fat, should only be allowed to be manufactured for sale under a special name and regulations approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries; and that when sold by retail it should be delivered to the purchaser in a wrapper, also approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. It would be necessary that factories where this mixture is made, and the premises of wholesale dealers who deal in it, should be registered, and that books should be kept on these factories and premises by which consignments of this mixture could be traced to the retailer."

The Government agreed with that view of the Committee, that the public had a right to buy any article if they knew what they were buying and what was its true value, but it should not be sold to them as butter. Therefore precautions were taken in the Bill, in regard to the sale and description of butter substitutes, to prevent them being sold under the name of butter. The description and name would have to be approved by the Board, and it would then be impossible to describe "milk-blended" butter in various forms as butter. The ignorant consumer who knew nothing about percentages might think the fact of the blending with pure English full-cream milk increased the value as butter. The fact that it contained 24 per cent. of water would convey nothing to his mind. He could assure the House that under the provisions of the Bill no description or name which would lead the public to believe that a butter substitute was genuine butter would be allowed by the Board of Agriculture. Under the proposal of the Bill every man would have to produce his butter substitute and give his description of it and the name would have to be approved by the Board. There was no idea of allowing men who applied to register butter substitutes to place all their articles under the same name and description. Every case would have to be dealt with on its merits, and while the article would not be allowed to be sold as butter he could assure the House that it was not intended that the name should be such as would unfairly prejudice the sale of an article. The object was that the butter substitute should be sold as what it really was and not as butter, and that the farmer should have a right to his own trade mark of "butter" which ought not to be infringed by the sale as butter of a substance which was not the genuine article. Clause 5, dealing with imported butter, increased the *maximum* penalty in certain cases from £20 for the first offence to a fine of three times the value of the butter. In view of the large consignments imported this was advisable as a consignment might be so large as to make the £20 fine inadequate. The more stringent provisions in regard to imported butter had provoked some criticisms. The presumption would be against the importer in the event of the Government chemist certifying against the butter, and he would have to prove that the butter was not adulterated. In regard to imported butter, that was not unfair, because there was no power of inspection during its manufacture as in the case of English butter. Clause 7 contained a new provision requiring that margarine should be so described in advertisements, and Clause 9 applied the penalties of the Food and Drugs Act to offences under this Act. There would, he hoped, be general agreement on the principle of the Bill to which he asked the House to give a Second Reading in order that it might go to the Standing Committee, where its details could be thoroughly threshed out and discussed. As to those details he did not pretend that the Bill was an inspired document, and he was quite ready to be convinced in regard to any alterations which it might be desirable to make. He could assure the House that the only object of the Government was to put down the gross frauds now being perpetrated in the butter trade. He begged to move.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) had no doubt there would be a majority in favour of the Bill, because it had the practically unanimous recommendation of the Committee; but he took the opportunity of saying there were grave defects in it; for instance, the unnecessary stringent and restrictive clauses in regard to factory butter and the extraordinary provision for 24 per cent., not 16 per cent., of moisture in butter substitutes.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Not sold as butter.

MR. FLYNN said the Department of Agriculture took power by regulation to prevent the sale as butter. The Bill was to protect the consumer against fraud, corruption and dishonesty, and against unfair foreign competition; but the provision in respect to milk-blended butter was not drawn in conformity with the recommendation of the Committee, and certainly not with the overwhelming evidence given before the Committee, because with the exception of one or two specious witnesses who tried to prove that this water-logged butter was not so bad after all and that the poor people who bought it were not misled, the evidence was all the other way. In Committee Irish Members would do their best to improve the Bill in that respect. As to margarine, there would not be much difference of opinion. The evidence given of ingenious malpractices showed that, though the advocates of margarine contended that it was wholesome, nutritious, and palatable, yet they wanted to sell it under some other name. The whole idea was to mislead the consumer. Beyond question there was a difference of opinion among Irish Members and farmers as to the percentage of moisture that should be allowed in butter and what was called Irish salt firkin butter. Some of his colleagues were very pertinacious in regard to that subject, but he, as a representative of a butter-producing constituency, asked the Government to stand firm and not to allow the exclusion of any Irish-made butter from the 16 per cent. limit. No friend of the Irish farmer or of the Irish dairy trade would consent to place such a stigma upon Irish butter, which had such a high reputation and character among the butters of the world. All the efforts of modern manufacturers had been in the direction of producing butter with less moisture in it. And every representative of that school of thought who twelve months ago was in favour of 20 per cent. of moisture was now in favour of the smaller percentage of 15 or 16. Only recently Members of the Irish Butter Trade Association had seen the necessity of protecting their butter from unfair competition, and were now prepared to accept 16 per cent. all round.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) said he did not intend to take up the valuable time of the House with a lengthy discourse on the Bill, but as one of the Members of the Committee who sat on this question for three months of last year under the Chairmanship of the hon. Baronet the Member for Somerset, who with such patience, such clearheadness, and such ability, discharged his onerous duties, he might be able to place a few useful facts before the House. The main outlines of the Bill were based on the recommendations of the Committee, and were it not for the speech of the hon. Member for North Cork, he would not have risen on that occasion. Clause 19 of the Committee's recommendations said—

> "In this connection, the exemption of Irish salt firkin butter from the 16 per cent. standard of moisture, frequent references were made by witnesses to the manufacture of salt firkin butter by Irish farmers on hill-side farms. This butter is a special article made with brine. The object of adding brine is to preserve the butter and to give it a flavour which is appreciated by consumers in certain districts.
>
> "Numerous witnesses expressed the opinion that no special exemption as to salt firkin butter manufactured by Irish farmers is desirable. Your Committee concur in this view.
>
> "They think that the existing law should be sufficient to prevent the manufacture by farmers in Ireland of salt firkin butter containing an unreasonable or fraudulent amount of moisture, and so far as this kind of butter is concerned they do not recommend any further legislation."

The provisions of the Bill as it now stood were not too stringent in dealing with the dangerous and evil practices of those counterfeiting butter. Some of the witnesses examined in Committee gave very sad evidence of the terrible doings resorted to by designing, dishonest traders. The Bill, with some slight modifications, or perhaps changes, to express more clearly the import of some of its provisions, was a very good Bill. The hon. Member for North Cork seemed to think he had a right to speak for Ireland all over, but he represented only the views of the merchants, the gombeen merchants, of Cork, and the majority of the farmers of his own constituency, if the truth were known, would prefer that both systems, the old one of farmers making the butter in their own dairies, and the new system of the creameries, should run concurrent; and naturally so, as the competition would create higher prices. He (Mr. Lundon) spoke for the farmers of the county Limerick, for those of Clare, Tipperary, and of other counties, who had, through their county councils, their district councils, corporations, and other public bodies, sent, from time to time, resolutions passed unanimously by, in the majority of cases, practical farmers, repudiating the hard and fast line of a 16 per cent. standard of moisture in Irish salt firkin butter. Would the House make a law depriving the honest farmers of the county Clare, in which from Killaloe to Loop Head only two creameries existed, of the right of making their butter in the best way they could so as to meet their requirements and pay their rents? In the county Tipperary, just outside where he lived, from the eastern boundary of his constituency to Toomevara, and from Dundrum to Nenagh, about forty miles either way, in that sixteen hundred square miles of elevated tableau of mountain ranges, some twenty miles away from railways, there were only about a half-dozen creameries, one in Reigh, one in Kilcommon, one in Hollyford, and one near Upperchurch or Glastragan, with one or two others farther east. If this 16 per cent. standard was to be adopted according to the great genius of the hon. Member for North Cork, what became of the brave and industrious men of north and mid Tipperary? It was the butter merchants of Cork who first attempted the ruin of the Irish butter trade. Some years ago they shipped first-class Irish butter to Denmark, and under a Copenhagen brand transhipped it to London, placing it on the counters in the latter place as Danish butter, and exposing alongside it third-class Irish butter in firkins with a first-class brand: thus, by a mean trade dodge, ruining the reputation of a splendid article so as to make money by a fraudulent transaction. This thing soon came to an end, but they next resorted to the bringing over to Cork of Copenhagen firkins, which in turn went down, and the third move resulted in branding in the stores the Cork-made firkins as Copenhagen, and sending them down even to county Limerick with money in advance to secure the trade in that county in opposition to the butter-buyers of Limerick and Tipperary. So much for the magnanimity of the Cork butter merchants, now so strenuously championed by the hon. Member for North Cork. The real meaning of this advocacy of the 16 per cent. standard was that, if it should become law, the farmers of the south and west of Ireland, not having modern appliances to ensure their being capable of bringing their butter below the legal requirement, would be driven to the alternative of selling their commodity in the lump butter markets. The unsalted butter being a perishable article would, on occasions, be bought by the agents from Cork at perhaps 25 per cent. below its value, and thence taken to the Cork factories, would be rehashed up and exported to London when butter might be in demand, but at slack times cold stored without any date on the labels and sent out, only to meet the high prices when the quality might have deteriorated. So much for the paternal care of a splendid Irish product on the part of the Cork merchants and their worthy representative in that House. So persistently did they hold out that Cork was everything that their conduct would aptly fit in with the rhyme—

Cork above and Cork below,
Cork so high and Cork so low;
Cork so tender and Cork so tough,
Of Cork, God knows, we have got enough.

The solicitude of the Cork men over the character of Irish butter was mainly in their breeches pocket. He hoped that the hon. Baronet, with some slight but necessary alterations in the Bill, would succeed in stopping the flood of villainy being practiced under the mixing of margarine, milk-blended butter, and other counterfeits, to the detriment of the pure and genuine article.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, Further Proceeding was postponed without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 4.

ADMIRALTY ADMINISTRATION.

*MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) rose to call attention to the Admiralty administration, and to move: "That this House, while recognising the services rendered by the Admiralty, regrets to observe evidence of ill-considered changes vitally affecting the war readiness of the Navy; the House is of opinion that its control over the Navy in recent years has been, and is being, weakened by the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty from the House of Commons, by undue secrecy, by sudden changes of policy, and by Admiralty officials resorting to novel methods for the purpose of influencing public opinion." In moving this Resolution, he desired to state that he had not the slightest personal hostility to the Board of Admiralty, though he had been informed that feelings of hostility had been imputed to him. If that charge were really true, he would be guilty of great ingratitude after the kindness, courtesy, and consideration with which he had been treated by the Board. Because he had asked a Question about Sir John Fisher it did not follow that he was prompted by hostile feeling towards that distinguished Admiral. He objected to the Admiralty resorting to secret methods, and had the House been asked to vote a salary of £5,000 a year to Sir John Fisher he would gladly have supported it; but he was opposed to the secret method by which an Order in Council was passed which did not appear in the *London Gazette*, and about which they knew nothing in the House, until he happened to find out by accident what had been done and asked a Question over a year after the event. This secrecy was very detrimental to the House's control over the proceedings of the Board of Admiralty. The method of secrecy was being extended, for naval men were giving less and less information. During 1905 there was a scare about the guns, and they were therefore interested in getting all the information they could about guns from the Government in 1906. The Admiralty had replied by removing all information about the guns ordered from the Estimates of 1906. Then the question of training was raised last year, and they wanted all information in the Estimates as to how the nucleus crews were distributed and trained. In 1907, on opening the Estimates, he found that this information was removed, and he believed that the Admiralty had only done that because of the general belief that the sea training of the Navy was suffering. The official reason given was that it was impossible to give the usual information, as the nucleus crews of the Home Fleet had not been settled when the Estimates were framed. But surely the Secretary to the Admiralty might have given him a more frank assurance in answer to the question which he had put to him that day, that he would have all the information reinserted in next year's Estimates—information of such great value. That policy of secrecy had been condemned by previous First Lords of the Admiralty. It was strongly condemned by the First Lord of the Admiralty in 1902. The policy, as far as he could gather, was to shelve discussion as much as possible in that House and in the country. At the same time another process went on, of giving one-sided information to favoured newspapers. The result had been that in the Royal United Service Institution, the official debating place, there had been no naval discussions at all, except one lecture by a retired officer; no officer on the active list got up there at all. He regretted very much this want of discussion in the United Service Institution. Sir John Colomb, a very able member of the Conservative Party in the last Parliament, once read a paper which led to the formation of the Naval Intelligence Department and the Admiralty at the time did everything they could to stop his doing so. He thought any attempt to suppress discussion was most mischievous. He had two quotations, one from the late Lord Salisbury, and the other from a Cabinet Minister of that time. Lord Salisbury said—

> "The defence of the country is not the business of the War Office or the Government, but the business of the people themselves."

The Cabinet Minister said—speaking at a dinner in 1902—

> "If the Government had made mistakes it was largely because the people of the country had failed to impress on Governments what they ought to do."

He submitted that it was absolutely impossible for the people to exercise any control over Imperial defence unless the fullest possible information was given; they could not criticise mistakes when they lacked full information. He believed that secrecy was only used to conceal the poverty of the defence. He remembered the story told by the present First Sea Lord, Sir John Fisher, when Admiral superintendent at Portsmouth. He took the French Naval officers round the dockyard on the occasion of their visit. There was an empty store, and when the superintendent came to it, after having shown the party the places of interest, he pointed to the locked door, and the sentry stationed near, and said to the French Admiral, Admiral Gervais—

> "I have shown you everything, but I have the most imperative orders not to show you what is going on in that store."

That illustrated the value of secrecy; it was an empty store. But he was afraid that the policy of empty stores was one which had been liberally applied for some years past. They had never had a thorough investigation, for instance, of the *personnel* of the Navy, or of what Lord Selborne called the far-reaching reforms which he carried out in 1902, and which had since been developed. There had been various methods of justifying the changes, and they had been asked by Lord Tweedmouth to wait seven or eight years to see the result of the experiments which were being carried out. Personally he was not prepared to wait for eight years if the changes were bad changes. If the changes were good changes he thought the Government could very well grant the prayer of the 225 Members who had asked for an inquiry into the whole of those changes, without any executive authority asked for, but simply that the

House might be informed as to whether the changes were good or bad. In reference to the scheme of changes effected in 1905 by Lord Cawdor, they were told for a long time that the Douglas Committee were making a very full inquiry and a very full Report. It turned out to be practically a Departmental Committee, and the Report was first of all refused to them by the Secretary of the Admiralty, but subsequently granted in the House of Lords in response to an appeal by Lord Goschen, who pointed out that the Report had been quoted in official documents. That Committee lasted exactly six weeks. Its inquiry was supposed to be in regard to this great revolution in the training and distribution of officers of the whole Navy. It sat once a week, and it devoted two days to the engineers, one day to the marines, and one day to an artificer and a stoker. This artificer was hostile, and the stoker said that he would like to see the position of the stokers improved. It was a very perfunctory inquiry. The one day devoted to the marines elicited the fact that all the marine witnesses thought that under this scheme they were to be abolished. The inquiry was really a bogus inquiry altogether, and the fact that they were refused this Report, and that it was a bogus inquiry, he thought justified their demand for a very full inquiry into these changes. He should add that the evidence submitted to the Committee was very conflicting, and that there was a minority Report of which they had never heard, this condemnation of the scheme being signed by the representative of the Royal Marines. It was very unfortunate, as showing the atmosphere of suspicion which existed. An officer who signed that minority Report, after being a few months at his billet in the Intelligence Department, a post which he ought to have held three years, was sent to a cruiser on the China station, immediately after signing that Report. That created a bad effect. That was in 1905. He did not say that it was done as a punishment, but he could not ignore the belief of the service that the officer had dared to express an opinion differing from the opinion of those in authority who had formed that Committee, and therefore he was sent out by the Admiralty to the China station. He was by no means contending that many useful reforms had not been carried out by the Board of Admiralty. The introduction of the French nucleus crew system was decidedly good, but it was being carried too far when nucleus crews were put in charge of practically new ships; they were never full crews, but partly-manned crews which were called nucleus crews. The nucleus crews system was creating a great deal of discontent. They had officers devoting themselves for six or seven months to the training of men, and it was heart-breaking at the end of that time to see those men sent away to another ship. Not long ago he asked how many captains and crews the "Barfleur" had had, and he was informed that she had had six captains and five crews during a period of two years. Would any business man change the manager of his works six times and his staff five times in two years and call it good business? It was very bad business, and it was creating a good deal of discontent in the Navy. There was no doubt that the reason so many men were deserting from the Navy was that they objected to being shifted about so much; they did not get a chance of knowing their officers. He thought the improvement in the gunnery was very much to the credit of the Admiralty. It was only fair that if they blamed the Admiralty when things went wrong and harm was done they should praise them when good work was done. He had been told that this was due to the zeal of the sea officer and improvements in the telescope. One of the service papers which acted as a sort of semi-official organ for the Government, the *Naval and Military Record*, stated that with the new telescope, which possessed 23 magnifying power, they could see the dimple on a fair girl's cheek 2,000 yards away. The Board system, as it existed, had received very high praise from the Esher Committee. The essence of the Board system was that the Prime Minister chose a broad-minded and capable administrator who could estimate the value of evidence and choose good advisers, and under those circumstances the Board had always worked well. If on the other hand they chose a First Lord who was a fool and did away with equality in regard to the advisers, that was the way to wreck the Board. Many evils had resulted from the fact that the equality of the Naval advisers had been done away with by the Order in Council issued under Lord Selborne in regard to the distribution of business on October 20th, 1904. There had been one necessary change by which the First Sea Lord for the first time, through the Committee of Defence, had access to other Cabinet Ministers besides the First Lord of the Admiralty. This extra power should, however, have made Lord Selborne more careful not to extend further the primacy of the First Sea Lord. Instead of this course being taken the First Sea Lord had been made Chairman of the Designs Committee and the Dockyards Committee, giving power over the *matériel* of the Navy such as Moltke never possessed over the equipment of the German Army; and Chairman of the Estimates Committee. Lord Selborne had also introduced this distribution of business by which all the other Sea Lords and the Civil Lords were ordered to submit any important changes to the First Sea Lord, who had the power of deciding whether those important changes should come before the Board. That change was carried out when Parliament was not sitting. He had detected a tendency to carry out changes at a time of the year when Parliament was not sitting. He thought the tendency of the First Lord's being in the House of Lords was to make the representatives of the Admiralty in the House of Commons quite irresponsible. For instance, the Secretary to the Admiralty on 24th May last year had expressed himself as decidedly hostile to the early entry of officers, whereas early entry lay at the root of all the changes in naval training to which he objected, and if it were abolished then all Lord Selborne's and Lord Cawdor's changes in naval training would go with it. If a First Lord was in the House of Commons and had made that criticism he would have immediately been called upon to justify his views. If he were in that House he would have to stand the whole racket of debate, of answering Questions and Motions, and defending the Estimates, and then Members could find out whether he was a capable administrator or not. Again, they could not in the least bring to book the First Lord's statements in another place. By way of illustration he referred to the statement of the First Lord that the nucleus crews had diminished the number of ships out of repair in the most extraordinary manner, a statement which the First Lord based on a comparison between January 1904 and 1907, which left out material factors so as not to spoil the percentage of 1907. He would take that statement as a test case. The statement had gone forth in the First Lord's speech in the other place and also in the explanatory statement of the Navy Estimates, that in the third week of January, 1904, out of sixty battleships, thirty-eight were unavailable owing to the need of repairs, or 63 per cent. of the whole, and that on the 21st of January, 1907, out of fifty-one battleships only eight, or 16 per cent., were unavailable. Let the House mark the words "unavailable owing to the need of repair." After that Lord Tweedmouth said—

> "The Admiralty took the official returns from the dockyards, which gave the dates of taking in hand, completion, etc."

Hon. Members would know the difference between ships needing repair and taking those repairs in hand. Complaint had been made that the Admiralty were not taking the repairs in hand to the extent they were leading them to believe. The "Goliath" was put down for £48,000 and the "Canopus" for £25,000, and neither of those ships figured in the eight ships which the First Lord of the Admiralty included as needing repair. He had been furnished through the kindness of the First Lord with a list of the thirty-eight battleships needing repair in 1904, and he found amongst them the "Monarch" which was simply a depot ship being used to house the crews of ships. Amongst others he also found the "Rupert," which never in her history had been a battleship. No officer of the Admiralty could possibly have made the mistake of putting the "Rupert" in the list of battleships needing repair, and it looked very much like hoaxing the public. It had been acknowledged that ten ships in 1907 were utterly out of repair, and yet they were included in the list of first-class battleships in order to swell the strength statistics. In the First Lord's list of ships needing repair they were, however, excluded as they would spoil the percentage.

In 1904 there was a very extensive policy of reconstruction in progress by which ten battleships and fifteen cruisers were being reconstructed. All those ships which were being reconstructed in 1904 were included in the First Lord's list as needing repair, whereas no ships were being reconstructed now. It was one of the complaints against the Admiralty that whilst rival Powers were reconstructing the Admiralty were doing nothing in the way of reconstruction, because it made no show and enabled them to use obsolete ships to swell the statistics. Another instance of a misleading statement was the First Lord's reference in another place to the mobilisation of the ships on 14th June last year and the wonderful rapidity with which it was carried out. The First Lord insisted that it was a surprise mobilisation, whereas if he had consulted *The Times* he would have seen that the mobilisation was fully anticipated. Lord Tweedmouth, in the same speech, said—

> "These ships responded to the test put upon them. There was no necessity for a proclamation to call out the Reserves or anything of that sort. They went to sea with full crews with the extreme rapidity I have indicated."

If Lord Tweedmouth would consult *The Times* he would find: (1) that on 7th June, seven days before, the Admiralty issued the appointments of officers; (2) that on 9th June the arrival of reserve men at the ports took place; (3) that on June 12th a complete official list of vessels for the manœuvres appeared in *The Times*, and also the order that all leave in the ships was to be stopped, and all offices concerned with mobilisation to be kept open day and night; (4) that on 13th June *The Times* contained the intimation that the reserve squadron would be mobilised the following day. *The Times* added—

> "The numbers required to bring the vessels up to war strength are held in readiness at the naval bararcks, with steam-boats in attendance to embark immediately the order to mobilise comes to hand."

Such manœuvres might be called Zanzig manœuvres, because every officer knew that they were coming off. There was another hoax which had been played off on the House, namely, the distribution hoax. They had been told that the new distribution was going to increase the fighting efficiency of the Fleet. If that statement had not been made it would not have been necessary to attack it. The statement was most misleading. Lord Cawdor's Memorandum of November, 1905, stated that there were seventeen battleships in the Channel Fleet. Lord Tweedmouth had met the increase in the German Fleet by reducing the number of battleships in the Channel Fleet to fourteen. It had for some days been cruising with only eleven battleships. Lord Cawdor's Memorandum stated that there were thirty-three battleships in full commission in 1905. The number had now been reduced to thirty-two. In 1905 they were distributed over three Fleets, whereas now they were distributed over four Fleets, and he had yet to learn from any historical teaching that dispersion was better than concentration. Of the thirty-two battle ships in full commission, six were only nominally under the new arrangement of the Nore Division, having only two-fifths of their complements, who were to be assisted by boys, youths, and second-class stokers. To say that such methods increased the fighting efficiency of the Fleet was most misleading. The only real increase in efficiency which he had been able to trace had been in the torpedo flotillas. They were undoubtedly increased. He deprecated the concentration by which so many men were employed on torpedo craft, which, as experience had shown, was only secondary work in actual warfare. He would like to see the concentration work devoted to battleships and cruisers rather than to destroyers. On the question of shipbuilding he was not going to deal with matters which could be discussed on the Estimates, but he protested against the enormous fluctuations which occurred in the shipbuilding programmes of this country. The House hardly realised how enormous these fluctuations were. In the Estimates of 1899 they laid down fourteen armoured vessels, while this year the number was three. In the two years 1889 and 1890 thirty-six protected cruisers were laid down, while for the years 1905 and 1906 there were none. In the three years 1894 to 1896 seventy-nine destroyers were laid down, and for the three years 1905 to 1907 the number was eleven. These enormous fluctuations from abnormal programmes to programmes which were very small were very detrimental to the country, and very bad for all the shipbuilding interests. There were similar variations of policy in regard to the types of ships. One year they built enormous cruisers, and in another year very small cruisers. He was told that Lewis Carroll used to compose his humorous books by writing sentences on little strips of paper, then putting all the bits of paper into a hat, shaking them up, and letting the sentences run on just as they chanced to come out. The Admiralty might just as well make up their ship-building programme that way—put a number of types into the First Lord's bowler, and let the Secretary to the Admiralty take out the first that came. In that way they might arrive at a programme like the present year's—three battleships, one scout, five destroyers. There had been too little consistent policy, too much experimenting in the Navy. He begged to move.

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said it was with very considerable hesitation that he accepted the invitation of his hon. and gallant friend to second this Motion. It might easily be supposed that he did not possess any of that expert and strategical knowledge which alone could qualify any Member of the House to take part in debates on this particular subject with authority, and the reasons which had induced him to accede to the request made to him were the reflection in the first place that all Members of the House, and indeed the whole community, were under obligation to the hon. Member for the time and industry which he had devoted to naval questions; and in the second place, he was influenced by the consideration that if, after all, the question of naval policy was to be left entirely to the discussion of experts who claimed to have particular knowledge, the number of those who could take part in a debate must be strictly limited. It would be admitted that those who were not experts were under obligation to form the best judgment they could on the extremely important question involved in Motions such as that before the House, and there was no more obvious method of resolving doubts than that of asking the Secretary to the Admiralty, when occasions for doing so were presented, questions such as made it difficult for the hon. Gentleman to avoid giving an answer. He ventured to think that very few of the questions which had been addressed to the Secretary to the Admiralty in the last few months would have been necessary, and that the greater part of the debates on the Navy would have been avoided, if it had not been for certain extremely ambiguous references to the maintenance of the two-Power standard made by the Prime Minister last year, and also the Secretary to the Admiralty during the present session. Every unprejudiced observer would agree that, whether or not at a given moment there had been apprehension that the two-Power standard was being deviated from, persons of all political views had until this Parliament held that the two-Power standard should be maintained as the criterion of our naval strength. The Prime Minister was the first to give rise to serious doubt as to the view which the Government entertained on the two-Power standard, when in July last year he said—

> "When you talk of the two-Power standard after all you cannot keep out of your mind what the two Powers are. I do not object to the two-Power standard as a rough guide, but this is a two-Power standard of almost a preposterous kind."

The definition of the two-Power standard admittedly was not dependent on any strictly logical principle, and among the different definitions which had been offered, the one which had held the field premised that there should be no inquiry as to what the two Powers were. The Secretary to the Admiralty speaking on 5th March said—

> "Originally the two-Power standard meant two specified European Powers. It was not a standard in the abstract, but at best it was only a rule of thumb—a rough and ready test. There might be conceivable circumstances in which the two-Power standard was too much, and imaginable circumstances in which too little."

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON explained that what he had said was that while under certain circumstances a two-Power standard might be too much, there were conceivable circumstances in which a three-Power standard wou'd be too little.

MR. F. E. SMITH said he meant to say that, and he entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman. Did or did not the right hon. Gentleman adhere to the statement of the Prime Minister that they should not keep out of their mind what the two Powers were? Even last month the Prime Minister used this expression—

> "Supposing we were at any time to be in close alliance with the two Powers with the largest navies, however close that alliance may be, should we rigidly adhere to the two-Power standard?"

He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to tell the House explicitly whether it was the view of the Government that the two-Power standard might vary according to the view the Government formed at a given moment in regard to our alliances with other Powers? The preamble of the German Navy Bill might possibly supply some assistance in answering the question what a two-Power standard ought to be. The words were—

> "Germany must have a fleet of such strength that a war even against the mightiest naval Power would involve risks threatening the supremacy of that Power."

The debate was a strictly non-Party one, and he did not desire to make any attack on the Government. But he would remind the Secretary to the Admiralty that in 1904–5 the expenditure on the Fleet was £42,000,000, while in 1906–7 it was £36,000,000, or a reduction of £6,000,000. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] He did not in the least quarrel with the cheers with which those figures were received. He was rather disposed to think that the temporary paralysis of shipbuilding abroad, which had been occasioned by the building of the "Dreadnought" might be sufficient justification for that reduction. Yet it should be remembered that in 1904–5, when the expenditure of the Navy was higher than in any single year of our history, the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said at a meeting of the Eighty Club—

> "I want to see the British Navy still stronger than it is, a fighting instrument always ready to strike, for then, it is almost certain, it will not be called upon to strike."

He had listened with interest to the explanation of the Secretary to the Admiralty as to the relative strength of the great maritime Powers to-day. At first sight it appeared that his explanation was a complete and persuasive one; but there were one or two points, not clear to his mind, on which some further information might be given. It was stated that if they took battleships less than eighteen years old, Great Britain had fifty-two as compared with forty-nine possessed by France and Germany. Great Britain had thirty-seven battleships less than thirteen years old, and France and Germany had forty-one. Great Britain had nineteen battleships less than eight years old, as contrasted with twenty-eight possessed by France and Germany. He asked the Secretary to the Admiralty what difference in the judgment of his advisers the comparative age of our battleships and those of France and Germany made in estimating the relative strength. As he understood, at the present time the total number of battleships in our Navy was sixty-three, if those built, building, and projected were counted. Of these, forty-seven were unarmoured over the portion of the water-line, while in the Fleets of France and Germany, none of the battleships were unarmoured over the water-line. What deductions did expert opinion allow under this head in the consideration of relative strength? Of our sixty-three battleships, he understood that two were building, that nine were admittedly obsolete, thirteen were to have no more repairs bestowed upon them, and six were at the present time under repair. That left thirty-three battleships in full commission. The statement was very frequently made, when a comparison was drawn between the battleships of this country and France and Germany, that we built, or had facilities for building, vessels better than any other country in the world. He wished to know whether that statement was accurate in the opinion of those who to-day advised the Admiralty? The Cawdor Memorandum laid it down that every ship ought to be completed in twenty-four months, yet the "Minotaur" and "Defence" would take three years and two months. Why was the time so greatly exceeded in these instances in relation to the time mentioned in the Cawdor Memorandum? Was there any similar instance in Germany? He did not propose to ask any questions as to the strategical distribution of the Fleet, but he would put one or two in regard to the non-strategical distribution of the Fleet. He understood that when the late Government left office, there were thirty-two battleships always at sea, and fourteen battleships in reserve with nucleus crews, or forty-six in all. At present, there were six battleships in the Mediterranean instead of eight as before; in the Channel fourteen, instead of sixteen; and in the Atlantic, six instead of eight. In the result, there were at present only twenty-six sea-going battleships, instead of thirty-two. If however, the hon. Gentleman said that the Nore Fleet was a fully sea-going Fleet, then as against fourteen vessels in reserve at that date there were only seven in reserve now. In the words of Admiral Sir W. May—

> "What the sailor needs is the sea, the sea and manœuvres at whatever cost, and they are very expensive. But it is useless to have a Navy unless we are prepared to pay all the expenses of training at sea."

In 1904 the right hon. Member for Dundee stated that the Admiralty formed the view that the strength of the sea-going Fleet was greater than strategy demanded, but his hon. friend the Member for Fareham, who had considerable opportunity of ascertaining what was the opinion of the Admiralty at that time, denied that and said that he had never heard at the Admiralty the opinion that the strength of the sea-going Fleet was too great. He wanted to know if there was any truth in statements which had been made that to some extent at least the complements of the Fleet at the Nore were made up of boys, and that the ships were going to be used as training colleges? If the change was dictated by economy, what was the economy likely to be obtained? He would like to ask the hon. Gentleman whether or not it was the view of the Admiralty that 70 per cent. of sea-going time of the men at the Nore would make them effective? An extremely interesting discussion had been raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, as to the policy of the Government in regard to cruisers. The right hon. Gentleman said it was ancient history now to build cruisers, as far as the protection and destroying of commerce were concerned and that we could hold our hands in that respect. The right hon. Gentleman said the whole policy of naval experts had been revolutionised as far as the building of cruisers was concerned. He would like to know if that view was shared by the Government, and whether the Secretary to the Admiralty had reason to believe it was shared by foreign Powers.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said that he founded his statement entirely upon the action of foreign Powers and on the estimates of foreign Powers.

*MR. F. E. SMITH was obliged to the right hon. Baronet and had no doubt the Secretary to the Admiralty would tell him whether he was right in gathering from the German naval estimates that that Power intended to build two new fast cruisers annually. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would say whether that view was correct or whether the view the right hon. Baronet had brought forward was well founded. But there was a more important consideration in reference to this question of building cruisers, as to which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty might be able to give some information to the House, and that was the proposals which the Government were likely to lay before The Hague Conference, or rather what was the position which the representatives of this country were likely to take at that Conference in regard to the proposal to forbid the capture of private property at sea. He asked what the position of our representatives would be and what effect the proposal would have, if adopted, upon the shipbuilding programme of the future. It was an extremely important question whether it was the intention of the Government to support that proposal. In conclusion there was one further branch of his hon. friend's Resolution upon which he wished to make a few observations. It was that part in which he complained of the methods of secrecy which had been adopted by the Admiralty. He did not think his hon. friend limited that complaint to the present Government or to the last twelve months or was desirous of treating the question as a Party one, nor did he wish to treat it as such, but he would recall the words of Mr. W. H. Smith who, he believed, was formerly a very capable and clear-sighted First Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Smith said—

"There was nothing in the objection that inquiry would give information to foreign Powers. For those who had the management of their navies knew a great deal more about our Navy than many of us did. The Government might suppress printed documents, but if he wanted information on the Navy he could get it at Berlin, Copenhagen or Paris if he chose to pay. The only effect of withholding information from England was to create the impression that it could not be given without damage to responsible officials."

The observation was profoundly true, and he therefore urged upon the right hon. Gentleman that he should be more communicative to hon. Members in all parts of the House. On 18th July 1906, the hon. Member for King's Lynn asked the Secretary to the Admiralty—

"What reserve of heavy guns was maintained by the German navy for battleships carrying four heavy guns each; and whether the guns in German fortifications generally corresponded to the guns on board the ships."

The Secretary to the Admiralty replied—

"So many questions have recently been addressed to me on the subject of foreign navy estimates, programmes and policy that I am constrained to ask my hon. friend and other hon. Members to excuse me from making statements on subjects as to which the Board of Admiralty have no official knowledge and can take no responsibility."

He would have thought, in the first place, that the Board of Admiralty ought to have official knowledge, and he was glad to call to his aid as a formidable ally in this contention the right hon. Gentleman himself, who when in opposition delivered a telling indictment of the Admiralty because they were not able to give him information as to the Russian Admiralty's policy. To take another Question which had been asked, and, in his judgment, had not been sufficiently answered, on 19th February, 1907, the hon. Member for Ludlow asked the Secretary to the Admiralty—

"If he has received any official report from Admiral Lord Charles Beresford as to the sufficiency of the Channel Fleet; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any action in consequence of the report."

The Secretary to the Admiralty replied—

"The Admiralty must, in the interest of the public service, decline to allow their confidential communications with the officers of the Fleet to be the subject of Parliamentary inquiry."

He quite assented to that in so far as the declaration in reference to Parliamentary inquiry was concerned, but he thought it could hardly have been very injurious either to admit or to deny the receipt of a report. Again, on 21st February 1907, the hon. Member for King's Lynn asked—

"How many skilled and how many unskilled ratings are embraced in the two-fifths complement of nucleus crews, and how many will there be in the new skeleton crews; and how many battleships and cruisers which, on 1st March 1906, were fully manned or partially manned, will, under the new scheme of distribution, be degraded to ships with skeleton crews."

In answer the Secretary to the Admiralty said—

"It has been the practice of the Admiralty to treat details of complement as strictly confidential, and I regret, therefore, that I cannot give my hon. friend the information asked for."

To be perfectly candid with the House, after he had read the Answer about Lord Charles Beresford he came to the conclusion that that was an instance in which the Secretary was justified, but what he complained of was that while information was refused to the House it was given to the Press to whom inspired communications were made. There was another Question to which, and the Answer to it, he would call attention. On 17th July 1906, the hon. Member for King's Lynn asked the Secretary to the Admiralty—

"Whether he can give an approximate estimate of the relative cost of eight battleships in full commission, such as the Atlantic Fleet, and eight battleships with nucleus crews on board ready for mobilisation, under the system established by Lord Selborne's Memorandum, 6th December, 1904."

The Secretary to the Admiralty replied—

"The Board of Admiralty are of opinion that it is not in the interests of the public service to give the information for which the hon. Member asks."

There was no question of strategy there, and it was eminently one for men of business in this House to consider, yet they were told that the information could not be given. Another Question, asked on 21st December, 1906, by the hon. Member for King's Lynn of the Secretary to the Admiralty, was—

"How many armoured cruisers during the present year have been in collision; how many have grounded with or without injury; and how many have been put out of commission in order to enable engine-room or gun defects to be taken in hand."

The Secretary to the Admiralty replied—

> "It does not appear to be in the public interest that the information asked for by the hon. Member should be published."

In his opinion it had aways been in the interests of the Navy that any errors or alleged errors of seamanship should be ventilated in the House, but on this occasion the information necessary for them to form a judgment upon the matter had been refused. On Wednesday, 27th March, 1907, the hon. Member for King's Lynn asked the Secretary to the Admiralty—

> "How many signatures are required to make an order of the Admiralty executive in reference to the removal of an officer in command of his fleet, ship or barracks, or whether this power can be exercised by the First Lord of the Admiralty without the concurrence of the Sea Lords forming the Board of Admiralty; and whether he can state in what respects the practice is a variation, and under what Patent or Order in Council, from that pursued in April, 1795, when the decision of Lord Spencer to supersede Admiral Lord Hood in the command of the Mediterranean Fleet could not be carried into effect until he obtained the signature of two of the Sea Lords."

The Secretary to the Admiralty replied—

> "The Board of Admiralty are not prepared to discuss their present methods of administration of Admiralty business, and the methods practised by their predecessors in 1795. The hon. Member may rest assured that provisions contained in the Letters Patent under which the Lords Commissioners exercise their authority are duly observed."

He could not see why that Question should not have been answered. The utmost importance was attached by the Select Committee of 1861 to the question of signatures in order to prevent an individual acting for the whole Board in any important matter that was not of the most urgent character. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would have been well advised to answer it with the greatest frankness. What made the matter more galling and annoying was that, as he had indicated, side by side with deliberate and repeated refusals to give information in the House, there had grown a system under which inspired communications had been made not only to the Press but to persons organising agitation. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, asked for an explanation of the increase in the Vote for Naval literature from £73,299 in 1901–2 to £117,774 in 1904–5, said it was due to the expansion of the "intelligence publications." No one who had read the publications of the Admiralty during the last four or five years would be in any real doubt as to what was meant by the "intelligence publications" which had been expanded. It was common knowledge amongst those who had been reading these publications that there was a most deplorable change of tone in them some four or five years ago—that they were now marked by great levity, and that documents had been circulated at the public charge which had no claim to be paid for by the nation. These documents, some of which had come into his hands, were marked "Private and confidential." No one had a right to mark documents "Private and confidential" and then send them to the Press in the hope that, by so marking them, one might be discouraged in that House or elsewhere from discussing their contents. In one of these publications a deliberate request had been made that outside agitation should be conducted. It was written—

> "The Board of Admiralty would welcome outside pressure to enable them to nominate to Keyham as you suggest; but the outcry would be tremendous. We should be glad of the support of the engineering associations of the country, as doubtless we shall have to face much hostility, but we do not fear anyone. Do right and damn the odds."

In a letter on this subject obligingly supplied in an official memorandum an illustrious person wrote—

> "The Frenchman's Fleet appears now by the Gods,
> We'll fight them as of old, and damn the odds."

Of course distinguished persons might be guilty of levity, but their utterances of that character ought not to be printed and sent round at the public expense. The result of these publications had been that for the last four years Press cuttings had been printed and published by the Admiralty which should never have been printed and published by a Department of the State. There had recently appeared an extremely controversial pamphlet called

"The Truth About the Navy;" and of this the Admiralty had bought a great number of copies at the public expense and distributed them through every vessel in the Fleets. The Admiral of the Mediterranean Fleet, in response to the representations of his captains, refused to circulate the pamphlet on the ground that such publication was not in the interests of the service. As to the "Dreadnought," when he asked for certain information it was refused in the public interest. But very shortly afterwards a document was circulated to the Press, "not for official publication, but to serve as a guide to members of the Press, and not to be quoted verbatim." This document contained the very information which he had desired to obtain, information much in advance of any that had been published. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would persuade the Admiralty neither to allow their controversial methods to degenerate into a species of gasconade, nor to continue their gratuitous contributions to an economical Press.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House, while recognising the services rendered by the Admiralty, regrets to observe evidence of ill-considered changes vitally affecting the war readiness of the Navy; the House is of opinion that its control over the Navy in recent years has been, and is being, weakened by the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty from the House of Commons, by undue secrecy, by sudden changes of policy, and by Admiralty officials resorting to novel methods for the purpose of influencing public opinion."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*)

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee) admitted that this was an embarrassing Motion, for it was moved by a supporter of the Government, and seconded by one of their determined opponents. It was at once a Motion of confidence and a Motion of censure, and he accepted it for what it was worth. The second dubious characteristic attaching to the Motion was that it was an attack on two Administrations. Personally he was only responsible for one Administration. The Leader of the Opposition had laid down the sound proposition that the responsibility for acts done by officials rested not on them, but on the Government of the day; and, though the Government and the Admiralty were responsible for all that the officials did in their departments, they could not accept responsibility for what had been done by their predecessors. There were four charges contained in the Motion. The main charges made were to be found in the second part of the resolution. The question of the House of Commons' control over the Navy and the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty from a place in the House was one really for the Prime Minister; but he might point out that the present First Lord of the Admiralty and his two immediate predecessors had enjoyed long experience in the House of Commons, and knew the House of Commons point of view as well as any Member sitting in it. In the last twenty-five years out of nine First Lords six had been Members of the House of Lords and three Members of the House of Commons; but really this particular point might be more properly raised on Vote 12 of the Estimates. The second charge made was one of undue secrecy, amounting to a want of veracity on the part of the Admiralty and its representatives. The hon. Member for King's Lynn had been permitted to say in the columns of the *Spectator* that "we do not get the truth; we seldom do in regard to Naval matters," and at the United Service Institution the hon. Member permitted himself to use language calling in question the good faith of the Admiralty. His hon. friend was the last man in the world who ought to complain of want of information or of attempts at secrecy. In the short time his hon. friend had been a Member of the House the amount of information that he had extracted from the Admiralty was incredible. In the one year and a quarter he had been in office the hon. Member for King's Lynn had asked 196 Questions altogether. As the representative of the Admiralty, he was, of course, dependent upon official assistance. He instructed those who assisted him to give to every specific Question a specific Answer, without evasion, without argument, and in the fewest possible words. He appealed to the House whether the whole tenor of his replies had not been consistent in that respect. He could only charge himself, on looking back on the Questions which had been asked, with three important categories in which secrecy had been maintained. The first was as to the reserve of guns. He had refused altogether to give information about that, and he still adhered to that resolution. In the opinion of the Admiralty it was not desirable that our reserve of guns should be made known to the whole world. The necessity for that secrecy had increased since the Russo-Japanese war. Other nations also observed secrecy in this matter, and if the information was given we should be giving them a benefit which they took care not to give to us. He had also refused to answer certain Questions about foreign navies. They were apt to be invidious Questions. He had answered them as far as he could, but he ought not to be asked to give information about facts of which he had no official knowledge. Nor had he given Answers to Questions relating to the Home Fleet. The Home Fleet was experimental; it was still growing, and to make statements at this early stage as to future developments would only be to tie the hands of the Admiralty. He did not gather from the hon. and learned Member opposite that he complained of secrecy which had been maintained with regard to the "Dreadnought" and "Invincible."

MR. F. E. SMITH: I did complain that at the time information was not given to the House it was given in the Memorandum.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he would only say, that so much did he desire to give the House all the information that could possibly be given that he put in last year's Estimates rather fuller information about both the "Dreadnought" and the "Invincible," and he had not been asked to give more. He had not refused to give more, and he did not say that to give more was impossible, but so far it was rather fuller than had been asked for. He was sure that both hon. Members would accept what he said, when he stated that it was the belief of certain Naval authorities that the secrecy which had been maintained with regard to the "Dreadnought" and the "Invincible" resulted in a postponement of building by foreign Powers, which was a casual benefit to this country. He was not prepared to say more than that.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) reminded the right hon. Gentleman that when in opposition he had himself complained because this very information was refused to him.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he had asked for details which had been refused to him, but which had been given to *Engineering*. He had not made that a complaint. All he asked, if he remembered rightly, was whether the details published in the *Engineering* newspaper were correct. There was one occasion on which he had given the hon. and gallant Gentleman an inaccurate Answer, and he wished to be allowed to explain it away. It was a curious story. In August the hon. and gallant Member put a Question to him as to the number of German ships that were projected for the next two years. It was an unstarred Question, and in the official reply, prepared by an official at the Admiralty, instead of the figure "6," which was the correct figure, the figure "5" was inserted. By a pure clerical error "5" was given instead of "6." The hon. Member for King's Lynn called his attention to it and asked whether it was correct, and he told the hon. Member that it was wrong—that a wrong figure had been inserted by a slip of the pen; it was a pure blunder on the part of one of the subordinates. The hon. Member sent this correspondence to the newspapers, and one of them—he would content himself with calling it a Tory paper—received the explanation with derision and suggested that it was a false explanation. He could not correct the Answer because, as it happened, it was not printed in "Hansard"; and the incident passed out of his mind. To his surprise, four months later, a Question was put to him by a Tory Member, asking him whether he had not made an erroneous statement, why he had made it, and whether he proposed to correct it? On inquiry he found that this accidentally erroneous statement, made in August last year, which at the time was not printed by the official reporter at all, had actually made its appearance as an official Answer three months afterwards. He asked the official reporter how that had come about without any consultation with him. The reply of the official reporter was that he had been asked to print it by the hon. Member for King's Lynn; and the hon.

Member took that step, knowing that by a clerical slip the Answer was erroneous, and without giving him the opportunity of correcting it.

MR. BELLAIRS: May I explain?

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I decline to give way. I did not interrupt the hon. Member.

MR. BELLAIRS: Mr. Speaker, have I not the right to reply?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will have the opportunity of making a personal explanation.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that disposed of the charge of undue secrecy. Then he came to the other head of indictment—about the changes. It was said that changes had been made vitally affecting the readiness of the Navy for war. But no allegation had been made that the present Government had introduced any changes at all, good or bad, except in the case of the Home Fleet, which had already been discussed. Reference had been made to changes in the training of officers and men. As to these changes, the present Government continued the system they found in operation, or about to come into operation, as devised by their predecessors in office. They were not absolutely committed to these changes, but they determined to give them a full and fair trial and were watching and waiting as to the result. He was bound to say, speaking for himself, that in connection with Naval matters he was a good deal conservative. His own belief was that, after the very serious and important changes which had taken place, what the Navy wanted now was a period of rest and reflection during which the experiments might be left to work out their own development. He came to the last head of the indictment on which the hon. and learned Gentleman who seconded the Motion had spoken in a tone to which, seriously and frankly, he took no exception whatever. The greater part of his speech was a discussion of Vote 8, but he preferred to stick to the text of the Motion, and defer answering all those questions. He preferred to confine himself to the very important observations which the hon. and learned Member made, as he supposed, in justification of the last head of the indictment, as to the novel methods pursued by officials of the Admiralty in order to influence public opinion. Some of the statements made about these methods came to him for the first time. As to the document marked "private and confidential" he had never heard of it; and with regard to the pamphlet, "The Truth About the Navy," he was sure the hon. and learned Gentleman would accept his statement when he said that he had never read a line of it. He preferred to get his information officially. He did not know what the contents of the document were, but all he knew about it was that he had been told inside the office that, on the whole, with one exception, it was a fairly accurate account of what had taken place. He was asked if it was written by an Admiralty official, and had given the answer "No," and he did that upon information volunteered to him by a gentleman, who was certainly not an official, that he was the author. "The Truth About the Navy" was circulated to a certain extent among the Fleet by order of the Admiralty at a cost of £25. He might say also that their action in this matter had not been all on one side, because he found to his astonishment and disgust that the money for which he was responsible had been expended upon similar publications and that a publication in quite a different direction, "The Naval Annual," containing a long article attacking the policy of the Government by the hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the motion, was circulated at a cost of £127. There was also the Royal Naval List, which contained, not only an attack on the Admiralty, but a partisan attack on the Government of the day, and that was circulated at a cost of £11 18s. Again the United Service Institute—or Institution—had afforded a platform for attacks against the Admiralty, and that body was subsidised by the Admiralty to the extent of £375 a year. Looking at the matter seriously, he really thought it would be better to ignore all such publications and all journalistic writings, whether in attack or defence of the Admiralty. One other matter he wished to refer to in reference to the Motion, and he called the attention of the House to the terms. First, "ill-considered changes" were condemned, and this must refer to the action of the late Government, for the present Government had made none; but the allegation he wished to come to close quarters with was that these changes—ill-considered or sudden they might be, he would say nothing about that—had impaired the readiness for war of his Majesty's Navy. That was the imputation, and if that was not its meaning he did not know what meaning it could have. That was a grave statement to make, but did the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite concur in the statement, the more serious as coming from an hon. Gentleman who had been connected with the service? If he intended to say that, it was a most dangerous statement to make. He believed he was justified in saying that never in the history of the British Navy had it been so ready for war as it was at the present moment. Some allusion had been made to the question of repairs. On that point he might be permitted to say that the Admiralty increased the provision for repairs last year to the extent of more than a quarter of a million—£266,000—beyond the sum originally provided for by the Estimates, and they had increased the provision this year to the extent of £200,000 over last year. That provision was considered by the naval advisers of the Admiralty to be ample. Then as to the two-Power standard, let him say —he believed it had been already stated elsewhere by his noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty—that it was the determination of the Government to maintain our Naval supremacy as it stood now, and, in the event of The Hague Conference proving abortive, to hold themselves ready to take steps to maintain our relative position. That was all he would say on that point, and, in conclusion, he thanked the House for the hearing they had given him, and invited them to reject the Motion.

MR. BELLAIRS in making a personal explanation, said he thought that every Member of the House who asked a Question and got an Answer had the right to have the Question and Answer printed in *The Parliamentary Debates*. Finding his Question was not printed, he went to to the official reporter, who consented to print it. He told the official reporter at the same time that the Answer was

erroneous, and that it ought to be six battleships instead of five. He asked him whether he should make the correction, and he said no, as he had no right to edit the right hon. Gentleman's replies.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) thought that this Motion amounted to a vote of censure on the Board of Admiralty, and would, if carried, lead to their resignation. He wanted to give the reasons why he found himself unable to support the Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman had said it would be the height of presumption for him to attempt to defend the late Board of Admiralty, but he hoped it would not be considered presuming on his part if he attempted to deal with the question of the continuity of policy of the two Boards, and gave that as his chief reason for not committing himself to the support of this Motion. He hoped, however, that the right hon. Gentleman would realise that dissent from this Motion did not commit him and his friends in any way to a general support of the policy of the Admiralty or preclude them from embarking on serious criticism of Admiralty administration on many points of detail when the proper occasion arose. But if they had grave doubts on certain recent developments of naval administration, he thought the attack should not be directed so much against the Board of Admiralty as against the Government itself, and particularly against the Prime Minister, for tampering with the shipbuilding programme in a fit of sentimentality and in the desire to assist The Hague Conference. He thought they had plenty of justification for attacking the Government along that line, but this sweeping condemnation of the Board of Admiralty was, he thought, not politic, and he would remind some of his hon. friends that the resolution, as a weapon of attack, might prove to have some of the peculiar and inconvenient qualities of the boomerang. What they ought to strive for was continuity of naval policy. They did not mean that kind of continuity which was now favoured by the Secretary of State for War, which consisted apparently in repudiating all the acts of his predecessor and in claiming that continuity of policy should only be prospective, and built only on the foundations which he himself had laid. They meant that the present Board of Admiralty should maintain generally the naval policy initiated by Lord Selborne and developed by Lord Cawdor, and handed on to Lord Tweedmouth. He wished he could say that the Government had lived up to its duty in that respect, quite as much as the right hon. Gentleman had suggested. The Opposition would like to take a non-Party view of this matter, and to give a general support to the Board of Admiralty that evening, but such a course was made very difficult for them by the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman on previous occasions. The Opposition had been denied proper and reasonable Answers to important Questions. They were, however, unwilling to join in a direct vote of censure on the Admiralty. One naturally hesitated to give a verdict in the absence of the full and authoritative information which alone could enable a competent judgment to be formed. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would have been better advised if he had made a clean breast of it in answering the Questions put to him by the Leader of the Opposition in the recent debate. As he was apparently unwilling to do so, an early opportunity would be taken in another place of asking the Government to reply on the points which had been raised. Those inquiries would be made under circumstances which would make it impossible for them to be evaded by the rules of debate. Meanwhile the Opposition were anxious to give the Board of Admiralty the benefit of the doubt. They were willing to assume that, subject to the financial restrictions imposed upon it by the Government, it had endeavoured to carry out in its broad outlines, at any rate, the general policy bequeathed by its predecessors. He did not wish to differentiate between the Civil and Naval members of the Board, for each member must bear the full responsibility for all Admiralty policy. He was sorry that the hon. Member for King's Lynn should have stated that the quality of the Naval advisers of the Admiralty had greatly deteriorated during the last few years.

MR. BELLAIRS said he did not remember making such a statement. What he said was that the First Sea Lord was no longer the first among equals, but was superior to others.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said he accepted the hon. Gentleman's explanation, but he strongly deprecated the singling out of any Member of the Board for special attack or denunciation as the hon. Member had in the case of the First Sea Lord.

MR. BELLAIRS: I made no attack to-day.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE admitted that the hon. Gentleman had come before them to-day more in the guise of a sucking-dove than of a roaring lion; but he thought that when the hon. Member read on the morrow his remarks he would see that he had singled out the First Sea Lord for attack.

MR. BELLAIRS said he had never singled out the First Sea Lord for consideratian. What he had said was that the First Sea Lord had been conceded too much power.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said that the impression of the hon. Member's remarks made upon his mind was as he had stated. But he did not think it was necessary for him, or anyone else to take up the cudgels on behalf of the First Sea Lord. He would do that for himself when, and if, his opponents appeared in the open. But that was a digression. What the Resolution invited the House to do was to attack, not an individual, but the Board of Admiralty in its corporate capacity. He had already explained why he personally was not prepared to join in an attack of that nature. He could only say that in the absence of definite and authoritative information he felt bound to refrain from giving a hostile vote and to suspend judgment on the latest developments of Admiralty policy. But, looking at the results as a whole, and mainly owing to the reforms introduced by the late Government, he was certain that the right hon. Gentleman was justified in saying there had been a great advance in the general efficiency of the Navy, and in the readiness of the Fleet for purposes of war. That was the true test after all, and perhaps the best critical summary of the present position of the Admiralty was that made by *The Times* Correspondent, who had been writing a series of articles during the last few months, wherein he said that the real question was *what* had been done not *how*, and that they might overlook some eccentricities of method if, on the whole, the right thing had been done strenuously and faithfully. Some mistakes had no doubt been made, and some steps had been retrieved, but the country would judge the Admiralty not by occasional mistakes, but by solid and substantial achievements. That was friendly, shrewd, and, he thought, reasonable criticism. He wished the hon. Member for Kings Lynn's Motion had been couched in a similar strain, but it contained within it several propositions to which the Opposition could not possibly agree. The hon. Member had also spoken of the demand put forward by 225 members of the House, for an inquiry into the administration of the Board of Admiralty; but if even 670 members had petitioned the Government of the day for such an inquiry, he hoped they would refuse it. [Laughter.] Well, perhaps he had exaggerated the numbers; but he appealed to both sides of the House that it was altogether out of the question that an outside body should inquire into the policy of the Admiralty.

MR. BELLAIRS said that 225 Members had never signed any application for an inquiry into the policy of the Admiralty, but as to certain changes proposed to be made in Naval training.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said certainly the impression he had stated was held at the Admiralty some time ago. In conclusion he hoped that he had succeeded in making his position, which was a somewhat difficult one, perfectly plain. Although he thought that the Admiralty during the last twelve months had done many things and shown many tendencies which were causing anxiety to friends of the Navy, yet at the same time many who sat on the Opposition side of the House could not support a direct vote of censure of this kind, which in its form he believed to be both inopportune and unwise, because its main effect would be to excite sympathy with the Board of Admiralty, at a time, too, when it was not sympathy they required, but the closest and most vigilant watching.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham) complained that he had received no answer from the Secretary to the Admiralty in reply to a Question on Tuesday in reference to the sale of obsolete ships that had been scrapped. At all times up to this occasion he had found the right hon. Gentleman very courteous in his replies, but in this instance, although he asked a specific question, no reply was given. If the right hon. Gentleman had not the information at his command at the moment, any hon. Member would be only too delighted to put down the Question and submit it again, because they were all aware that the replies to Questions were drawn up by the permanent officials at the Department. He had no desire to criticise the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman except in that respect, and he thought he should have been asked to submit the Question again. Pertinent replies should in his opinion be given to pertinent questions. He put the case of three ships, the tonnage displacement of which he estimated at between thirty and forty thousand tons. He had been informed that scrapped steel was worth £4 per ton. He estimated that these vessels should have realised £174,000, but they were sold for £57,800. That was a loss of £116,000 to the country. He urged that when ships were about to be sold they should be broken up in the Royal dockyards. There was every convenience, and few tools were required for the purpose. That would to some extent prevent the wholly senseless discharges at Woolwich and our other dockyards, which were national institutions, by giving employment to the men. These dockyards furnished the stable industry of the places where they were situated, which in many cases like Woolwich were going to wreck and ruin through these discharges. He did not join with the mover and seconder in their criticisms as to the policy of the Admiralty, because on the various Estimates he would have opportunities of bringing forward any points he had to raise; but he protested that when a Member raised a question over which the nation was losing thousands of pounds, he ought to have a reply and if it could not then be given he should be asked to repeat the Question.

* CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds) said it seemed to him that of all the ill-considered changes that might vitally affect the war readiness of the

Navy the insane desire of certain hon. Gentlemen opposite to reduce expenditure on the Navy in the interests of economy, without due regard to the interests of efficiency was the worst. He hoped that course of action would not be pursued after the statement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that it was the settled policy of the Board of Admiralty to keep the Navy in the same condition of preponderance in the future that it was now in. If that was the case, he hoped in the future they would hear no more of any reductions in the number of men belonging to the Fleet, because we could not possibly have the same preponderance and the same efficiency that we had now if the number were reduced. He was afraid they would be going back to the bad old days before 1889 if they made further reduction—the days when the Sea Lords of the Admiralty, instead of making their programme on the basis of what was required for the needs of the service, and stating what money was wanted, only gave consideration to the question of how best to use such money as was doled out to them by the Admiralty. What were the changes that had been introduced in the last few years? First, rapid shipbuilding had been introduced. That did not seem to be a very bad change, and if the present Admiralty were responsible in any degree for that change, they were to be congratulated. The building of the "Dreadnought" in so short a time had proved a great success, and he hoped the Admiralty would continue to make that sort of change. The next change was the reorganisation of the Fleet. He disagreed with those who thought it was bad that our main squadrons should be organised in four fleets instead of three, because so long as the four fleets were effective they were stronger for war purposes than three could ever be. And why? The Atlantic Squadron might be regarded as a reinforcing squadron for either the Mediterranean or Home Fleet in case the political situation abroad altered from what it was now. The formation of nucleus crews also was a most useful thing, so long as there were not fewer ships kept in full commission. Hon. Members must not forget that before these nucleus crews were organised, ships in reserve were to a large extent allowed to rot, but now, by putting officers and a certain number of men on board those ships, they stood a better chance of being kept in proper condition. It was for such reasons as these that he could not support this Motion. The elimination of old and small ships on foreign stations was also a good thing. He was aware that it was said that the elimination of these ships gave less chance for training officers, but there were other ships, such as torpedo boats and torpedo boat destroyers, in which young officers could be adequately trained, and in which they could attain a high state of efficiency. He therefore did not believe that it would be satisfactory to continue to build these small ships at great cost, and to keep them in commission on foreign stations. He had had a good deal of experience at the Admiralty, and he was convinced that the system of nucleus crews would tend to keep the ships which were in reserve in good condition and not allow them to rot through want of personal attention as they used to do. They wished to have as many torpedo boats and destroyers in commission as possible, so that the officers might get that sea training which was so essential to them, and which they could hardly get in any other way. The hon. Member had referred to the 225 signatories who wished to approach the Prime Minister with a view to getting the Admiralty to reconsider their decision on the question of naval training. They knew by past experience what had happened in regard to the reconsideration of decisions of that sort. It was within the memory of many of them, he dared say, how a reconsideration was come to over the question of water-tube boilers. The Admiralty were foolish enough to accede to the request of those who asked for an inquiry into that matter. What was the result? The only people who benefited by it were the Committee, who, by the time they had finished, had learned what were the real needs of the service with regard to water-tube boilers. During the time they were sitting they partially humbugged about eighteen of our then newest and best battleships and cruisers, by experimentally putting into them partly ordinary cylindrical boilers and partly water-tube boilers. The Committee was appointed to consider the advisability of the installation of water-tube boilers, and afterwards it was found that there was no necessity for the Committee as everyone was aware now of the efficiency of that class of boiler. He believed himself that the Committee which was asked for now was not necessary. If they would only allow the rules which were being evolved by the present Board of Admiralty with reference to training gradually to develop, if they would allow the Admiralty a reasonably free hand to see a gradual development in the right direction, he believed that the new system of training would be a thorough success. He did not believe that a Committee sitting to examine into the methods of the Admiralty would recommend anything of practical benefit which the Admiralty would not concede on the advice of their experts, and he did not think it desirable that such a Committee should be granted at all.

Mr. BELLAIRS asked leave to withdraw the Motion after the discussion which had taken place. [Cries of "No, no."]

Leave to withdraw being refused,

Question put, and negatived.

HOURS OF LABOUR (BAKEHOUSES) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Captain Hervey.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) thought that they could not enter upon a consideration of the regulation of the hours of work in bakehouses without time for a full discussion of the subject. If they began to regulate the hours of bakehouses they would also have to consider the price of bread.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he had received representations from his constituents, who pointed out that the Bill introduced regulations for which they did not ask, and which would prevent their commencing their labours before a certain hour in the morning, and compel them to cease at a certain hour at night. The regulations which were proposed would, if carried out, be extremely hard upon men in a small way of trade. It was quite possible that some regulations might be required for big manufactories, but he was only speaking for his constituents in pursuance of his duty, and he submitted that it was not desirable that a Bill affecting a trade, whether in a large or small way, all over the country, should be rushed through the Second Reading stage at the last moment of the sitting, when the matter could not receive that attention which it deserved, though it was one which affected a great many people in all constituencies.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey), in moving the adjournment, gave notice that to-morrow he would move the suspension of the Eleven o'clock Rule.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 18*th April*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Metropolitan Police Provisional Order.

Also the Certificates that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill: Marriages Provisional Order.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect of the petitions for additional provision in the following Bills: Midland Railway [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.] (Petition for additional Provision); Midland Railway Bill [H.L.] (Petition for additional Provision); Examiners' Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Memorandum on the teaching of arithmetic in primary schools: Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at a quarter past Three o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven O'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 18*th April*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITIONS FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Great Central Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Boston Spa Gas Bill; Shanklin Gas Bill; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

North East London Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Medway Lower Navigation Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Royal Insurance Company Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill.—Reported with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

North Eastern and Lancashire and Yorkshire Railways Bill. — Reported

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

[Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).

Sir LEWIS M'IVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Chorley; and Mountain Ash; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the United Free Church of Scotland, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Aberdeen; Dumfries; Edinburgh; Inverness; Kelso; and, Kirkcaldy; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Aberdeenshire; Crief; Dunoon; Hamilton; Kelso; Kilmarnock; Kirkcaldy; and Peterhead; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen (three); Annan; Bathgate; Birsay; Buckie; Dundee; Eaglesfield; Ellon; Glasgow (two); Greenock (three); Inverness; Kingussie; Lesmahagow; Melrose; Motherwell; Paisley (two); Perth; Petercoulter; Stonehaven; Stromness; and, Torry; to lie upon the Table.

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RIGHTS OF WAY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petitions for prohibition: from Bournemouth; and, Hinckley; to lie upon the Table.

SCHOOL BOARDS CONFERENCE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Memorandum on the teaching of arithmetic in primary schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order with respect to the Urban County District of Cookstown [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

JAMAICA.

Copy presented, of correspondence relating to the resignation by Sir A. Swettenham of his office as Governor of Jamaica [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT (1907–8).

Copy ordered, "of Statement of Revenue and Expenditure as laid before the House by the Chancellor of the Exchequer when opening the Budget."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 115.]

EAST INDIA (EXCISE COMMITTEE).

Address for "Return of Orders of the Government of India on Chapters II. and IX. of the Report of the Excise Committee, 1905–6."—(*Mr. Herbert Roberts.*)

SANITARY OFFICERS IN RURAL DISTRICTS.

Return ordered, "of the Medical Officers of Health and Inspectors of Nuisances in the Rural Districts of each county in England and Wales, showing the area and population of each district, and, as regards each officer, the amount of his remuneration, whether repayment is made in respect of it by the county council, and whether he holds any other appointment or carries on any other occupation."—(*Sir John Dickson-Poynder.*)

INTER-IMPERIAL TRADE.

Return ordered, "showing, for the last year for which figures are available:—(*a*) the value of all articles imported into the United Kingdom from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and British South Africa, respectively (i.) free of duty; (ii.) subject to duty; (*b*) the value of all articles imported into Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and British South Africa, respectively, from the United Kingdom (i.) free of duty; (ii.) subject to duty."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.

Accounts ordered, "of Receipts and Expenditure, with Balance Sheet, for each year 1900 to 1906."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

QUETIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Postmen's Promotion.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General what is the system under which the seniority of the postmen for promotion is calculated; whether by date of Civil Service appointment or by other means; whether there is a general system all over the United Kingdom; whether it differs in any respect from the systems employed regarding sorters and sorting clerks; and, if so, what are the reasons for this different treatment.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Postmen rank as a rule according to date of appointment, though exceptions are made in cases where this practice would discount considerable unestablished service. As regards the other classes mentioned by the hon. Member, which are recruited by competition, in the case of persons entering by the same examination the place taken in the examination normally determines the seniority. The system in each case is uniform throughout the United Kingdom.

Dublin Assistant Postmen.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that there are in Dublin sixty-six assistant postmen who were formerly ex-telegraph messengers, and that despite a recent revision there are still thirty-four of them with from two to more than four years service as assistant postmen for whom there does not appear to be any immediate chance of full-time appointments; and whether, in accordance with the promise made by a previous Postmaster-General, he will take steps immediately to find full-time established appointments for these men.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The position of the ex-messenger assistant postmen at Dublin received my attention when the revision proposals referred to by the hon. Member were being considered, and, although the largest possible number of established appointments was granted, I regret that it is not at present possible to provide all those who have considerable length of service with full-time established appointments. The promise made by one of my predecessors was not as stated in the Question. It was to the effect that he would endeavour to reduce the force of assistant postmen as opportunity occurred, to such a number as would make it possible, as a general rule, for the members of that class to obtain promotion to the class of established postmen after not more than three years' service as assistant postman, and in the case of ex-telegraph messengers, as far as practicable, by the time they attained the age of twenty. In pursuance of this promise the force of assistant postmen at Dublin has been reduced from eighty-six to forty-six under the recent revision.

Sligo Land Appeals.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that out of a list of 265 Land Commission Court appeals listed to be heard by Mr. Justice Dodd at Sligo, on 18th March, 1907, and following days, it turned out that thirty-two appeals only required a hearing, the rest having been withdrawn or settled as the result of land purchase; will he say if these 265 appeals were a portion of the number of appeals pending to dispose of which Mr. Justice Dodd was appointed; and is he aware that of the appeals at present recorded as pending a very large proportion are in reference to holdings already sold to tenants and will never require to be heard.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the Land Commission that the preliminary list for hearing at Sligo on 19th March and following days contained 265 appeals, of which sixty-four were excluded by the Judicial Commissioners from the final list. The remainder, 201, was the most that the Commissioners considered could be disposed of on the occasion. Between the dates of issuing of the final list and the date of the sitting fifty-six appeals were withdrawn by the parties, leaving 145 for hearing by the Court. Of this latter number thirty-two went to hearing, the remainder having either been settled in Court or withdrawn by the parties because purchase negotiations were pending or for other reasons. The 265 appeals referred to were included in the Return of appeals outstanding on 31st January last, subsequent to which date Mr. Justice Dodd was nominated as an additional Judicial Commissioner for the purpose of hearing such appeals. The Land Commissioners do not think that any general deduction can be drawn from what happened on this occasion. They cannot say how many of the pending appeals may ultimately be withdrawn by reason of purchase proceedings. In many such cases the fact that purchase negotiations are pending and that the appeals will not be proceeded with is not brought to the Commissioners' knowledge until the very eve of the hearing. This was specially the case in regard to the Sligo appeals.

Irish Urban Rating Law.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a deputation representing some sixteen urban district councils from the North of Ireland recently waited on the Local Government Board for Ireland for the purpose of pointing out the serious defects in the present rating law in urban districts; and, if so, is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session to amend the defects complained of.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reply to the former part of the Question is in the affirmative. The question of introducing legislation, with the object of facilitating the collection of rates and removing certain difficulties, to which the deputation called attention, is under the consideration of the Government, but I do not think it will be possible to introduce a Bill this session.

Belfast Post Office Telegraph Department.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General how many members of the telegraph messenger staff are permanently employed on indoor duties in the telegraph department of the Belfast post office, and what is their respective rate of weekly pay; whether in rotation they are called upon to perform a duty of eight hours on one Sunday in every four without remuneration, and, if so, upon what grounds, and how many are invariably employed on duty each Sunday; and whether the members of the indoor telegraph messenger staff are the only individuals in the employment of the Post Office who are obliged to discharge Sunday duty without remuneration; and can he state the principle upon which they are thus so exceptionally treated as compared with other members of the service.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Nine telegraph messengers are permanently employed on indoor duties in the telegraph department at Belfast, they are on scale wages, 8s. by 1s. to 10s. a week. In rotation, two of them are called upon to perform about seven and a half hours duty, once every fourth Sunday, on an average. The pay for telegraph messengers, both indoor and outdoor, is based upon a weekly attendance, covering the whole seven days. There are other classes of post office servants whose weekly wages include payment for regular duty on Sundays.

West Indian Mail Subsidies.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Postmaster-General what are the steamship subsidies paid for the conveyance of mails from this country to Jamaica and other West Indian Islands; and what is the annual sum received for postage in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The only subsidy at present paid for the conveyance of mails from this country to the West Indies is† that received by Messrs. Elder, Dempster, and Company, under a contract with the Crown Agents for the Colonies, which provides for a service to and from Jamaica for commercial as well as postal purposes. The postage on mails sent from this country by this service may be estimated at about £4,000 a year.

Cavan Postal Arrangements.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will have a letter-box erected at Owengallis cross roads on the route from Bawnboy post office to Drumtober national school, in county Cavan; and, in view of the fact that this letter-box would be a convenience in the district, will he give the matter first consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Sidney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

Antrim Postal Arrangements.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the change recently effected in the delivery of letters in the Grange Corner postal area, county Antrim, has resulted in the letters addressed to certain houses in the area being delivered later instead of earlier than before; and whether he will consider the practicability and advisability of having the Grange Corner mail delivered at that post office from Randalstown instead of from Toome Bridge.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this point, and will send the hon. Member a reply.

Indian Railway Inquiry.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the urgency and importance of the Indian railway question, he is now in a position to say when the departmental inquiry alluded to in his reply to the deputation of 12th March will be instituted; what its scope will be; and what will be the constitution of the body to which it will be entrusted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The committee of inquiry will begin work very shortly. It will be directed to inquire into and make recommendations upon the sufficiency of the amounts allotted in recent years for railway construction and equipment in India; the method of raising and applying further amounts, if such are found desirable; and the system under which the Railway Board now works. The Committee will consist of Sir James Mackay, Chairman, Sir Felix Schuster, and Mr. Abrahams representing the India Office, and Sir David Barbour and Sir Walter Lawrence representing the Indian railway companies.

Castletown Bere Estate.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Leigh White entered into negotiations for purchase with the tenants of his Castletown Bere estate, and, prior to doing so, he served a number of civil bill ejectments, some of which were for only one year's rent; and seeing that the tenants offered to leave the purchase price to the decision of the Estates Commissioners or Congested Districts Board, whether he will say what action the Estates Commissioners will take in the matter.

---

† £40,000 per annum.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Purchase agreements in respect of the estate referred to were lodged with the Estates Commissioners in December, 1905, but the case has not yet reached its turn to be dealt with. The Commissioners have no knowledge of the circumstances alleged in the question, but will, when dealing with the estate, give full consideration to any facts which may be brought to their notice by the tenants.

MR. GILHOOLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the estate of Mr. Leahy, Castletown Bere, county Cork, and Mr. Leahy agreed to leave to the arbitration of the Estates Commissioners the purchase price the tenants should pay, including arrears, and that subsequently Mr. Leahy wrote to the Estates Commissioners withdrawing from that agreement, and served them with writs and civil bill ejectments; and whether, seeing that the relieving officer of the Castletown Union has been served with fourteen notices of ejectment, he will say what action the Estates Commissioners will take with regard to the sale of this estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that the landlord agreed to leave the purchase price in this case to the arbitration of the Estates Commissioners. Last autumn it was represented to the Commissioners that differences existed between the landlord and the tenants as to terms of purchase, whereupon the Commissioners offered their services as conciliators under the Lord-Lieutenant's regulations. At an interview between the Commissioners, the landlord's agent, and the tenant's representatives, it was suggested that the Commissioners should have the holdings inspected, with the object of estimating, for the consideration of the parties, the prices which should be given. The landlord, however, declined to permit inspection or to consider terms of sale for the part of the property in dispute, alleging that the tenants on that part of the property had declined to pay rent for the last year. In the circumstances the Commissioners were obliged to withdraw from the matter, and cannot take further action.

Ballingeary Assault Case.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the recent hearing, at Macroom petty sessions, of some cases of alleged assault against a number of young girls from Ballingeary, the presiding magistrate was Mr. O'Hara, resident magistrate; will he say if Mr. O'Hara was formally moved to the chair by his brother magistrates, or if he took it as if it were a right appertaining to his position as resident magistrate; does any such right exist; and, if not, will an instruction be issued to Irish resident magistrates that they should not take the chair at petty sessions unless they are moved to it by their brother magistrates in the usual course.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that there was no formal moving to the chair on the occasion mentioned, but Mr. O'Hara was asked to take it by the majority of the magistrates present at the opening of the court. A resident magistrate is not chairman of petty sessions by virtue of his office. It rests with the magistrates present at each court of petty sessions to select one of their number as chairman, but whether by a formal vote or by general concurrence is a matter entirely for themselves. Mr. O'Hara informs me that he has never assumed a right to take the chair, and I have no information that any other resident magistrate has claimed such a right. In the circumstances there does not appear to be any reason for issuing instructions in the matter.

Kilfinane Town Tenants.

MR. SHEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received any application from the tenants in the town of Kilfinane requesting them to advance money for the purchase of their holdings; does this town form a portion of an estate which is mainly agricultural and on which a sale to the rural tenants has already taken place; and will he explain the powers of the Estates Commissioners to advance money for the purchase of their holdings to town tenants in circumstances such as the present.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received from the town tenants referred to an application that their holdings should be included in the sale of Colonel Gascoigne's estate, and have directed their inspector to inquire into the matter. Proceedings for the sale of the rural portion of the estate have been instituted before the Commissioners. The general question of advances for the purchase of town or village holdings is dealt with in the Lord-Lieutenant's regulations of 13th November, 1906, to which I beg to refer the hon. Member.

Coachford Evicted Tenant.

MR. SHEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners received an application for reinstatement from an evicted tenant named Jeremiah Murphy, formerly of Aharrin, Coachford, county Cork, on the Bowen-Colthurst estate; has a sale been arranged to the tenants on this estate, and have these made it a condition of purchase that Murphy should be reinstated; have different inspectors of the Estates Commissioners inquired into the claims of this evicted tenant; and, if so, what has been the nature of their reports; did the middleman, Mr. J. H. Weldon, Killmallock, inform any of the inspectors that he was willing to dispose of his interest for a reasonable sum to the Estates Commissioners; and will he state the number of inspectors through whose hands the claim of this evicted tenant has passed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received Jeremiah Murphy's application for reinstatement. No proceedings for the sale of the estate have been instituted before the Commissioners, but they are informed that terms of purchase have been arranged with the tenants, who, however, are unwilling to sign agreements until Murphy is reinstated. Two of the Commissioners' inspectors have visited the farm, and have approached the middleman, Mr. Weldon, with a view to purchasing it. Mr. Weldon has not yet stated what sum he would require for his interest. The matter is still pending.

Coolroe Estate, Wexford.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the owner of the Coolroe estate has offered it for sale to the Estates Commissioners; and whether any progress has yet been made with regard to the restoration of the Coolroe evicted tenants to their homes.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The owner of the estate mentioned has intimated his willingness to accept the price provisionally offered by the Estates Commissioners, and proceedings for the sale have accordingly been instituted. The case has not yet reached a stage at which the matter of the evicted tenants can be dealt with.

Woolwich Arsenal.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lancashire, Brigg): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many boxes of ammunition there are waiting in Woolwich Arsenal for repair and overhaul.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is assumed that the Question refers to boxes for ammunition. A large number are now being repaired, and others will be dealt with during the year as they are required for use. The requirements of these boxes will only mature *pro rata* as filling work, etc., proceeds during the ensuing twelve months.

Colonial Premiers and the Reserve Forces.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if no opportunity is to be afforded the Colonial Statesmen now in the Mother Country of seeing the Yeomanry and Volunteer Forces, having regard to the efforts they are making in the several Colonies to develop national defence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No effort will be spared to procure for the Colonial Statesmen now in this country such opportunities as they may desire of acquiring information in regard to the Yeomanry and Volunteers.

Gun Velocities.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): To ask the Secretary of

State for War, if he can state the remaining velocity and angle of descent at a range of 5,900 yards, of the projectiles of the British 18-pounder quick-firing, British 15-pounder (converted), and latest models of French and German quick-firing field-guns, respectively; and also the angle of elevation corresponding to this range which has to be given to the gun in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The figures for the British and German guns are as follow. There is no reliable information available as regards the French guns:—

	British.		German.
	18-Pounder Quick-firing.	15-Pounder B. L. Converted.	
Remaining Velocity - -	743 f. s.	655 f. s.	756 f. s.
Angle of Descent - - -	23° 3′	25° 6′	22° 3′
Angle of Elevation - -	15° 2′	17° 7′	15° 7′

Tidworth Barracks Hospital.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it can now be stated at what date the building of the new hospital at Tidworth barracks will commence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is not possible to give a definite date, but the work in preparation for the new hospital work is so far advanced as to render it possible in a short period to arrange a contract.

Norfolk and Suffolk Artillery.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War if the 1st Norfolk (Prince of Wales' Own) Artillery and the 1st Suffolk Artillery will be embodied as usual during the present year; and where their training will take place.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The hon. Member apparently alludes to the annual training of two regiments, called respectively the Prince of Wales' Own Norfolk Royal Garrison Artillery Militia and the Suffolk Artillery Militia. The former regiment will train at Great Yarmouth from the 20th May to 8th June, and the latter at Harwich from 10th June to 29th June.

Nenagh Garrison.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received a memorial from the Nenagh Urban Council, the magistrates of county Tipperary, and the people of Nenagh, praying him to cause the reconsideration of the removal of the present military from Nenagh, in view of the feeling that has sprung up between them and the people of Nenagh of all creeds and classes; and whether he can state the nature of the reply to this memorial.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No such memorial has been received at the War Office.

Army Scheme—County Associations.

CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds): To ask the Secretary of State for War if it is intended, under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, that the establishment of county associations should be permissive; and, if they are permissive, what would happen to the existing organisation of the Militia, Volunteers, and Yeomanry in counties where associations were not formed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) In accordance with the terms of the Bill the associations need not be all established at once, but may be formed progressively. Until associations are actually formed the existing powers in relation to the Auxiliary Forces will continue.

Pay of Lieutenant-Colonels.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for War what sum has been taken in the Estimate for 1907–8 to meet the service of increasing the pay of lieutenant-colonels.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am in communication with the Treasury as to the rate of increase per arm, and I am not yet in a position to state the exact figures.

Cost of Autumn Manœuvres.

Mr. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what has been the total cost from all sources of autumn manœuvres during the last three financial years; and what sum has been provided for manœuvres during 1907–8.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The sums provided in Estimates for manœuvres and field training are as follows:—

1904–5	£250,000
1905–6	140,000
1906–7	145,000
1907–8	175,000

The expenditure on the two items is not shown separately.

Second Division Clerks.

Mr. FIELD: (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the total number of clerks, neither Second Division nor university graduates, who were admitted, without Civil Service examination, to the Colonial Audit Branch in London from its establishment in 1889 to the date of its reorganisation in 1906; and the length of service, the rate of salary, and the present position of each of such clerks now serving at Home or Abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The length of service, rate of salary, and present position of those still serving are as follows:—

	Length of Service.	Present Salary.	Present Position.
		£	
1	18 years 2 months	486	Chief Examiner, Headquarters (formerly Local Auditor, Gibraltar).
2	15 ,, 10 ,,	300	Local Auditor, Gibraltar (receives £50 for auditing Dockyard Accounts, £86 for the audit of Municipal Accounts).
3	12 ,, 4 ,,	460	Local Auditor, Uganda.
4	8 ,, 5 ,,	300	Assistant Auditor, East Africa.
5	7 ,, 11 ,,	320	Assistant Auditor, Uganda.
6	7 ,, 6 ,,	440	Local Auditor, Gold Coast.
7	6 ,, 10 ,,	340	Assistant Auditor, East Africa.
8	6 ,, 6 ,,	430	Local Auditor, British Central Africa.
9	5 ,, 1 ,,	360	Assistant Auditor, Southern Nigeria.
10	4 ,, 8 ,,	310	Assistant Auditor, Northern Nigeria.
11	4 ,, 6 ,,	100	Examiner, Headquarters.
12	4 ,, 2 ,,	310	Assistant Auditor, Southern Nigeria.
13	3 ,, 1 ,,	300	Assistant Auditor, Southern Nigeria.

Second Division Clerk Examinations.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, whether Second Division clerks who entered the Exchequer and Audit Department, prior to its reorganisation in 1906, generally scored high marks in book-keeping at the various examinations in which they were successful; whether book-keeping is now included in the competitive part of the examination for new entrants, and, if not, will he explain why.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The appointment of Second Division clerks to the Exchequer and Audit Department did not depend upon their proficiency in book-keeping, which was an optional subject. The new scheme of examination for the Exchequer and Audit Department which applies also to certain appointments under the War Office and Admiralty, has been framed, after conference with eminent head masters representing various types of higher grade schools, to attract able youths who have been educated in public schools, grammar schools, or other higher grade schools up to the age of eighteen or nineteen. Book-keeping is not included among the subjects, because book-keeping does not form part of the ordinary curriculum of many of the schools in question. Candidates are, however, required to pass in arithmetic; and it is provided that no candidate shall be confirmed in his appointment unless he has, during the probationary period, satisfied the Comptroller and Auditor-General that he has gained a sufficient knowledge of book-keeping by single and double entry.

Annual Leave in the Exchequer and Audit Department.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, whether he will grant a statement showing the annual leave allowed to each rank in the Exchequer and Audit Department, including the Comptroller and Auditor-General and the Assistant Comptroller.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I learn that the scale of leave authorised by the Comptroller and Auditor-General for the various ranks of the Exchequer and Audit Department is as follows:—

	Per annum.
Principal and senior clerks -	48 days.
Chief examiners - - -	36 ,,
Examiners - - - -	24 ,,
After 10 years service -	30 ,,
After 20 years service -	36 ,,

The Comptroller and Assistant Comptroller conform to the rules applicable to the Civil Service generally.

Code Telegrams.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been drawn to the frequency of mistakes made in code telegrams, and to the fact that a majority of these do not probably come under his official notice owing to the loss of time involved in addressing such complaints to local postmasters; whether he is aware of the probability of any telegram being misread so long as the present method of transcribing messages in pencil is continued; and whether he is prepared to consider the question of directing all telegrams in future to be typewritten.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I do not think such mistakes are frequent, having regard to the great number of telegrams transmitted. The question of typewritten telegrams is engaging my attention. Experiments have been made, but the results have not been altogether satisfactory. I believe that as a rule telegrams are clearly and legibly written, and I have had but little complaint on the subject.

Addresses of Private Telegrams.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, having regard to the inconvenience and annoyance caused by private telegrams having been opened by persons other than the addressees owing to the illegibility of the lead pencil directions on paper of the colour now used, he can see his way either to abolish the use of the present coloured envelope in all cases, or, as an alternative, to direct that telegrams bearing the words private, confidential, or similar indications, shall be delivered in envelopes on which lead pencil writing is more distinctly legible.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I cannot do better than repeat to the hon. Member the substance of a reply which I gave to the chamber of commerce of his constituency on this point a month ago. I said that exception was very rarely taken to the colour of the present telegram envelopes; any change in its colour would probably give rise to much complaint; that Postmasters-General had from time to time been urged to use distinctive envelopes for various classes of telegrams, but that the multiplication of forms of official stationary used at postal telegraph offices was most undesirable, and would undoubtedly tend to certain delay and possible mistakes in the treatment of telegrams.

Census Advisory Committees.

SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to the provisions of Section 9 of The Census of Production Act, 1906, stipulating that the advisory committees should include persons engaged in as well as conversant with the conditions of various trades and industries, he has taken steps for the appointment of such advisory committees; by what process it is proposed to select the members; and whether it is intended to invite nominations from chambers of commerce in the principal industrial centres.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) A general committee has been appointed to advise upon the general scope of the census of production, and the lines upon which the information required is to be obtained. Steps are being taken to appoint other committees to consider the special requirements of particular trades, which will include leading manufacturers and representatives of trade associations. Committees for the building, iron and steel, cotton, woollen and worsted, engineering, shipbuilding, and boot and shoe trades are at present in course of formation, and in each case the leading trade associations have been invited to suggest members. The question of the appointment of further committees is under consideration, and a similar method of selection will be adopted in these cases.

His Majesty's Customs Tide Surveyor.

MR. W. HOPE (Somersetshire, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether a tide surveyor, in the employ of His Majesty's Customs, has the right to take from boatmen timber which they have salved, when the boatmen have found the owners, and the timber, being only good for firewood, has been given by the owners to the boatmen.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It is laid down in the Merchant Shipping Acts that all wreck found by persons other than the owner must be delivered to the receiver of wreck. This officer, however, has instructions to permit any article which is proved to his satisfaction to belong to parties on the spot to be delivered by the salvors to such parties at once without demanding any fee, provided that there is no question as to salvage or customs duties, and of course in such a case the owner may do what he likes with it.

Shettleston Free Church Property.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Church Commissioners have decided that all the Free Church property in Shettleston shall be allocated to the United Free Church; and whether, in view of the fact that there is a substantial Free Church congregation in the district who will be left without a place in which to worship, the Commissioners will consider the advisability of making some financial provision for the religious needs of this congregation.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I understand that the Church Commissioners have decided that the Free Church property in Shettleston must be allocated to the United Free Church. The rest of the hon. Member's Question refers to matters which the Act leaves entirely to the discretion of the Commissioners, with which I cannot interfere.

Hanwell Vaccination Exemption Certificate.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that Mr. Reginald Hayles, of Hanwell, applied twice to the magistrates at the Brentford police court, on 2nd and 16th March, for an exemption under the Vaccination Act, 1898, and was refused; and what steps he proposes taking to give the conscientious objector a fair hearing.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have received two letters from Mr. Hales calling my attention to the case. The amendment of the law is under consideration by my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board.

Privilege Cabs.

Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is in a position to state when it is proposed to give effect to the unanimous recommendation of the Cabs and Omnibuses (Metropolis) Committee that the privilege system for cabs at metropolitan railway stations should be provisionally abolished for one year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) As the hon. Member is probably aware, I approached the railway companies, but they saw great difficulties in the way of carrying out my proposals. I am still in communication with them, and I still have hopes of obtaining the desired result by friendly arrangement. Owing to the number and different characteristics of the different stations affected the question is far from simple, but I am pressing forward my negotiations, and I have not relaxed in any way my declared intention of dealing with the matter.

Municipal Indebtedness.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is in a position to state the total amount of the municipal debt of England and Wales to the end 1906; also the annual cost of such debt, including interest.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I presume that the Question refers to the debt of all local authorities in England and Wales, and not merely to that of town councils. The latest available figures relate to the year ended March, 1904, and these show that the outstanding loans then amounted to £393,882,146, and that the loan charges in that year (including interest, repayment of principal, and sums paid to sinking funds) amounted to £21,675,645.

Midwifery.

Mr. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that there are only nineteen counties in England and Wales in which there are institutions approved by the Central Midwives Board for the training of midwives; and that there are only fifty-two approved institutions in England and Wales, of which thirty-five are voluntary and only seventeen Poor Law institutions, of which again six are in London and only eleven in the rest of the country; whether he will say if the Paddington, Farnham, and Epsom infirmaries are yet approved; whether in the voluntary institutions the probationers have to pay fees, and whether in the Poor Law institutions they pay none; and if he can state what way the fees payable in the voluntary institutions are generally disposed of.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that the figures in the Question are substantially correct, the precise figures being as follows:—

Counties in England and Wales in which there are institutions approved by the Central Midwives Board for the training of midwives - - - - - -	19
Approved institutions in England and Wales (of which there are 35 voluntary (*i.e.*, non-Poor Law), and 16 Poor Law, of the latter there are 6 in London and 10 in the provinces) - - - -	51

The Paddington, Farnham, and Epsom infirmaries have not been approved. I have no information as to the payment and application of fees in voluntary institutions. In Poor Law institutions there are usually no fees.

Proposed Vizamgam-Malia Railway.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the memorial from the Cutchi public of Bombay, urging that the proposed Vizamgam-Malia railway line should pass through the territory of the Rao of Cutch, has now been received and considered; has the Report on the reconnaissance of the two alternative routes yet been received and considered, and if any fresh reconnaissance has been ordered will he state its nature; and will he state when a decision as to the route to be adopted is likely to be arrived at.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member in December last.† I cannot state when a decision as to the route to be adopted is likely to be arrived at. So far as I am aware there is no intention on the part of the Government of India of proceeding with the construction of the Bombay-Sind connection at present.

Bengal Indian Education Service.

MR. MCCALLUM (Paisley): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the fact that only one Native of India has during the past seventeen years been appointed to the Indian educational service in Bengal, he will consider the claims of highly qualified graduates of English Universities who are Natives of India, and now serving in the provincial service, to promotion to the Indian education service.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Indian educational service, as distinguished from the provincial service, is intended to supply what is at present considered to be the minimum of European appointments necessary to ensure the due progress of education in India, and it is therefore intended to be recruited mainly from Europeans, and must for the present continue so to be recruited. I may explain that it differs from the provincial service only in so far as its pay and other conditions are fixed with reference to the scale necessary to attract Europeans, which is naturally higher than that required to secure Indians serving in their own country.

Irish Education Grant.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, is he aware that the Estimates presented to Parliament provide a sum of £2,000,000 and upwards for public education in Scotland and only £1,400,000 for Ireland, though the number of children to be educated in Ireland is practically equal to the number in Scotland; and will he say what is the reason for the difference, and take steps to bring the grant to Ireland up to that for Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am afraid that I cannot, within the limits of an Answer, discuss the question which the hon. and learned Member raises. I have repeatedly stated that the Irish Government are doing everything in their power to obtain adequate recognition of the claims of Ireland in respect of education.

Bundoran Evicted Tenant.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps are being taken by the Estates Commissioners to bring about the restoration of Francis M'Guinness, Bundoran, to the holding on the Tottenham estate, county Leitrim, from which his father was evicted.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the receipt from Francis M'Guinness of any application for reinstatement.

Glenboy Fair Rent Cases.

MR. DOLAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it is the practice of the agent on the G. S. Clements estate, Glenboy, county Leitrim, to have all applications for the fixing of fair rents transferred from the jurisdiction of the county court judge; and will he state by what authority the agent is thus enabled to prevent these applications being heard within any reasonable time.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that five out of six pending applications to fix judicial rents on the estate mentioned were transferred from the Civil Bill Court on the 6th March. The applications were transferred to the Land Commission on the application of the landlord made under the powers conferred by the provisions of Section 37, sub-section (4), of The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, no cause against such transfer having been shown by the tenants.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxvii., 1004.

Inspection of Irish Schools.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the rule by which inspectors of national schools are bound to give notice of the annual inspection to both teachers and managers is in many instances not observed; and will he see that this rule is enforced and the date fixed in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that under their rules the inspectors are not required to give notice of their intended visits to schools except when they propose to hold a formal inspection annual or otherwise. The Commissioners are not aware that inspectors have failed to give notice of their intention to hold formal annual inspections.

Royal Irish Constabulary Cadets.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether it is intended to hold any more examinations for Royal Irish Constabulary cadets; and whether the holding of these examinations is due to the insufficient supply of head constables qualified to fulfil the duties of district inspector.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) An examination is to be held on the 7th May. Under the existing regulations half of the examinations in the rank of district inspector are filled by the appointment of cadets and half by the promotion of head constables. Formerly only one-fourth of the vacancies was given to head constables.

Royal Irish Constabulary Barracks.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, to what extent separate sanitary accommodation is provided for the wives and children of members of the Royal Irish Constabulary living in barracks; whether there is any exception to the rule that one convenience only is provided for men, women, and children, as well as prisoners of both sexes; what means have the constabulary authorities of ascertaining that the sanitary accommodation of Royal Irish Constabulary barracks is wholesome; and whether the surgeon to the force exercises any supervision in this respect.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Separate sanitary accommodation for women and children is almost invariably provided at the larger stations, but it is not possible to provide such accommodation at many of the small rural stations where the premises are small. The latter stations are usually occupied by one married constable only, and in such case the necessity for separate sanitary accommodation is not so marked. Constabulary stations are periodically inspected by county and district inspectors, as well as by officers from headquarters, so that ample opportunity is afforded for bringing to notice any defects in the sanitary arrangements. The local medical attendants advise on all matters affecting the health of the men and their families, and the sanitary condition of the barracks. The surgeon of the force, who is attached to the depot, exercises no supervision in this respect.

Upper Ballinagh Evicted Tenant.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Thomas Forster, of Aughaweely, Upper Ballinagh, county Cavan, whose father, John Foster, was evicted from his farm in the same townland about twenty years ago, held under the Reverend Francis Sclater; will he say if the Estates Commissioners have inquired into the claim; and when is the matter likely to be dealt with.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners cannot trace the receipt from Thomas Foster of any application for reinstatement.

Callan Evicted Tenant.

Mr. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether negotiations for the sale of the Madden estate, Callan, county Kilkenny, are now proceeding; and, if so, what steps are being taken to reinstate Mr. Richard O'Mahony, an evicted tenant, on this estate; and whether he will consider the expediency of making public the report of Mr. Smyth, the inspector, who inquired into this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have made inquiries into the application of Richard Mahony. The landlord objects to any interference with the present occupier of the evicted holding, and the Commissioners understand that Mahony already occupies a farm of 112 acres elsewhere. The Comissioners have therefore decided to take no action in the matter. The reports of their inspectors are confidential documents and cannot be published.

Dingle Harbour Board.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Harbour Board of Dingle, county Kerry, have sent memorials asking for grants for the extension of the pier or the further dredging of the harbour; and whether, seeing that Dingle is one of the best fishing ports in the whole of Ireland, and that the present pier was built without any Government contribution, and the harbour authorities have gone into debt in trying to make the harbour suitable for fishing, and in view of the congested nature of the surrounding country and the dependence of the people on fishing, some assistance will be given to enable them to carry on this industry.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that the Dingle Board addressed to my predecessor a memorial asking for a grant of £5,000 for the purpose of extending the pier by 160 feet. The Board of Works, however, reported that the proposed extension would not effect the desired end; it would not reach out to low-water mark, and the chief advantage to be gained would be merely increased quay accommodation. The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that the existing pier was built without Government contribution. More than half of the cost was provided from State funds. The Congested Districts Board contributed £500 last year towards the cost of dredging the harbour. They have been obliged, owing to the state of their funds, to refuse a contribution this year.

Northumberland Artillery Militia.

Sir ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Northumberland Artillery Militia can be called out, assembled, and trained this year at Tynemouth, where the Castle Barracks are now empty, their arms and accoutrements being sent from Berwick, thus avoiding expense to the public; whether there is a battery at Tynemouth armed with modern guns, which do not exist at Berwick; and whether there is ample camping ground adjoining the Castle Barracks on which the Durham Artillery Militia, with a strength of 200 men more than the Northumberland Artillery Militia, have been previously trained.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) All arrangements for training and camps of the auxiliary forces are in the hands of the general officers commanding-in-chief. The matter raised will, however, be brought to the notice of the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief concerned.

Exchequer and Audit Department—Press Communication.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that an order has been recently issued in the Exchequer and Audit Department threatening with instant dismissal any employee who communicates information to the Press or to any outside person whatsoever; whether he will state who is responsible for the issue of this order; whether a Member of Parliament is entitled to obtain information respecting maladministration in any Government department, provided the Official Secrets Act is not contravened; and whether, seeing that this order would deprive the House of Commons of the power of criticising the permanent officials, he will take measures to have the order annulled and prevent its repetition.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The order to which the hon. Member refers is presumably the rule which, I am informed, has for a long time been operative in the department, and which prohibits communication to the Press of information derived from official sources. This rule is based upon the Treasury Minute of 3rd June, 1873, which, together with another Minute on a similar subject, was presented to Parliament in 1884 [Cd. 3951]. I do not think that the rule has the results suggested by the hon. Member, nor do I think it is expedient to alter or withdraw the Minute.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Promotion in the Navy.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Board are prepared to introduce into the Navy the principle of promotion exclusively by merit; and, if so, when do they propose to abolish the automatic promotions each year from the Royal Yacht.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): Promotion in the Navy is determined exclusively by merit, and the special promotions from His Majesty's Yacht are no exception to the rule, as only officers who merited promotion are appointed to her.

*MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Is not promotion from the Royal Yacht automatic and not by merit, and is the hon. Member aware that it has been officially stated in this House that in the ten years ending 31st December, 1905, forty-three commissioned officers of the executive branch have been thus automatically promoted?

MR. LAMBERT: No. Promotion in the Navy is exclusively by merit.

His Majesty's Ship "Dreadnought."

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg); I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how long His Majesty's Ship "Dreadnought" was kept waiting for her 12-pounder ammunition recently; whether this delay was due to the inability of Woolwich Arsenal to cope with the work owing to shortage of hands; and, if not, to what other cause is the delay attributable.

MR. LAMBERT: His Majesty's Ship "Dreadnought" has not been kept waiting for her 12-pounder ammunition. A demand recently preferred at Portsmouth for reduced charges, which do not form part of the fighting equipment of the ship, could not immediately be complied with in full locally, but the balance is available elsewhere. The suggestion in the second sentence of the question is without foundation.

H.M.S. "Phœnix."

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if H.M.S. "Phœnix" has been sold; and, if so, what was the price realised and received; and by what ship the "Phœnix" has now been replaced.

MR. LAMBERT: The "Phœnix" was sold at Hong Kong by public auction and realised £2,242. As this vessel was one of a number of small craft reduced from the active strength of the fleet in December, 1904, it is not proposed to replace her.

The Coastguard.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it has been decided to abolish the coastguard; if so, by whom are their duties to be discharged; and, if the coastguard is to be abolished or reduced, what men are to take their place as a reserve for the Royal Navy.

MR LAMBERT: I have nothing to add to the reply to my hon. friend the Member for Orkney and Shetland on the 21st November last.†

H.M.S. "Furious"—Case of Stoker Keeley.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the case of H. Keeley, now residing at 313, Battle Road, Hollington, near Hastings, who was severely injured by an explosion on board H.M.S. "Furious," at Gibraltar, in the winter of 1902–3; whether he is aware that, on that occasion, Keeley enabled all others to escape by his promptitude in giving the alarm, while he himself remained in the stokehold to draw the fires; and that, as a result of injuries received on this occasion, Keeley became subject to fits, in consequence of which he was invalided out of the Navy in September, 1906, and is now, owing to their increasing frequency, unable to work or to go out unattended; and whether the Admiralty will grant him a greater pension than 6d. per diem.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxv., 813.

MR. LAMBERT: There is no record of any such explosion or of any injury to Keeley. The disability for which he was invalided was not attributable to the Service, and the pension of 6½d. a day which he has been granted is the full amount which the circumstances of his case entitle him to receive from naval funds under the Regulations.

Anti-Opium Movement in the Malay Peninsula.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the meeting of the anti-opium societies of the Malay Peninsula, held at Ipoh on 8th March last, at which resolutions were carried demanding the abolition of all opium farms and the substitution for them of Government depôts and complete Government control, and also urging that compulsory registration of all opium smokers, as in Formosa and the Philippines, should be enforced by law; and whether the Government will take any action in the direction indicated.

I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the resolution recorded at the conference of the anti-opium societies of the Malay Peninsula, held at Ipoh on 8th March last, to the effect that the Government be requested to pass additional rules under the chandu shops enactment forbidding the sale of opium to any person under twenty-one years of age, and also forbidding the sale and use of opium in brothels, jinriksha depots, and other such public places; and whether the Government will take any action in the direction indicated.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I have seen a newspaper report of this meeting. His Majesty's Government are giving careful consideration to the opium question.

Opium Smoking in Penang.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to a Chinese proclamation issued by the Protector of Chinese in Penang on 8th February, 1907, and given by him to the opium farmers for distribution, the effect of which is to encourage opium smoking in the Colony; and whether, having regard to this unusual procedure and to the objection to a Chinese protector becoming a protector of Chinese vice, the Government will indicate to the Governor of the Straits Settlements their disapproval of the terms of this notice.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have seen in a newspaper what purports to be a translation of this notification. The Governor of the Straits Settlements will be asked for a report on the subject.

White Police in British East Africa.

MR. NIELD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the size and nature of the force of white police now being recruited for British East Africa.

MR. CHURCHILL: I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given to the Question of the hon. Member for the Kingston Division on the 10th instant,† to which the Secretary of State has nothing to add.

Transvaal Government and Chinese Coolie Repatriation.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in view of the establishment of responsible government in the Transvaal, whether the arrangement for repatriation of Chinese coolies from Imperial funds is to continue; and, if so, for what period.

MR. CHURCHILL: This matter is forming the subject of discussion with the new Government, but no decision has yet been reached.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 200.

The Nairobi Case—Captain Grogan.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Captain Ewart Grogan, now imprisoned in East Africa for holding an unlawful meeting at Nairobi, is the explorer of that name who, during his march from the Cape to Cairo, was for some months in the interior of Africa accompanied only by Native servants; whether Captain Grogan some time since, with a view to assisting in the development of British East Africa, settled at Nairobi with his family, and induced some of his friends to take the same course; whether Captain Grogan, as chairman of the Colonists' Association, lately represented to the local authorities that the attitude of the Wakikuyu towards the white population has changed for the worse, and requested that increased police protection should be afforded to the settlers; whether his representations were disregarded until he publicly caned three of his boys for deliberate insults to English women; whether, immediately after that occurrence, the Secretary of State authorised the raising of twenty, since increased to forty, white police for the protection of the settlers, and on whose recommendation the authority was given; and whether it is in consequence of a crowd having collected while the boys were flogged that Captain Grogan and his friends have been convicted of holding an unlawful meeting and imprisoned.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has no official information as to Captain Grogan's explorations. He has now been for some little time resident in East Africa, and has obtained a large forest concession from the Government which so far he has not developed. The Secretary of State is not aware that, previous to the flogging of the natives on the 14th March last, Captain Grogan had made the representations referred to by the hon. Member. The raising of a small white police force had for some time been recommended by the Commissioner of the Protectorate, and provision for raising it was inserted in the Estimates for the financial year 1907–8, which were prepared in the Protectorate as far back as November last. The increase of the number from twenty to forty was, however, decided upon in order to deal with such lawless acts as that of which Captain Grogan has been guilty. It is clear from the reports received that Captain Grogan and his follow-offenders announced their purpose of flogging the natives in a public place with a view of inducing a crowd to assemble to witness and participate in their unlawful acts. The House must not assume that I admit that the expression "caning three boys for deliberate insults to white women" expresses at all accurately what took place.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the hon. Gentleman inquire as to the alleged discontent among the whites?

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Is it not the fact that this alleged discontent is very largely caused by the alienation of large tracts of land from the natives?

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): Will the hon. Gentleman inquire if the representations referred to in the Question were made?

MR. CHURCHILL: It is very difficult to see how such inquiry can be made.

MR. CARLILE: It is not for me to guide the hon. Gentleman.

MR. CAVE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether Captain Grogan contracted a dangerous illness while serving in the Matabele war, and has lately had a return of such illness; whether he is imprisoned at Nairobi or Mombasa; and, if the former, whether on the high or low ground.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has been informed that the facts as to Captain Grogan's medical history are as stated in the first part of the hon. Member's question. He has ascertained that he is now in good health and is confined in a house on the high ground at Nairobi, where he is daily visited by a medical officer.

MR. CAVE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when Papers on the subject of the Nairobi incident will be laid upon the Table.

MR. CHURCHILL: Papers will be laid in due course, but I cannot fix a date at present.

Sir Alexander Swettenham.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when the Paper referring to Sir Alexander Swettenham's resignation will be issued.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Paper will be presented immediately.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Will it include the letter of the American admiral to Sir Alexander Swettenham, as well as the latter's reply, and also—what is most important to the House and the public—the letter sent by the mayor to the admiral and the admiral's reply?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the right hon. Gentleman had better await the publication of the Paper. In some respects it will fulfil his wishes, and in others it will fall short of them.

German Settlements in the Far East—Sales of Opium.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the German Government has agreed to suppress the sale and consumption of opium and morphia in the German settlements in China and at Tsingtau (Kiaochow.)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): We have no information on the subject at present.

SIR H. COTTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, Sir, it is a matter on which the German Government act on their own responsibilities.

British Trade in Eastern Persia.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the active participation of the Consuls of other Powers in commercial affairs in Eastern Persia, our own Consuls have received instructions to forward the interests of British trade.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Consuls in Persia have instructions, as have Consuls elsewhere, to accord to British enterprise all the assistance that it can properly receive, and quite understand what their duties are. There is no occasion for special instructions in this instance.

Mesopotamia Oil Concessions.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has now received any information showing that a concession of the deposits of mineral oil in Mesopotamia has been granted by the Porte to the persons representing the Anatolian Railway; and whether this concession is still in force.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Information has been asked for from His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople, but not yet received.

Congo Free State—Lado Enclave.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the length of the lease of the Lado Enclave to the Congo Free State; and whether there is any power to determine the lease at an earlier date or to cancel it for any cause and regain possession of this tract of country, so as to have it administered by Englishmen and not by officials of the Congo Free State.

SIR EDWARD GREY: In Answer to the first Question, I have to refer the hon. Member to Article 1 of the agreement of 12th May, 1906, between the Congo State and the United Kingdom (published in Treaty Series No. 4, 1906). The Answer to the second Question is in the negative.

Egyptian Agent-General.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the *status* and powers of the new Agent-General in Egypt will be identical with those of his predecessor.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the affirmative.

New Hebrides.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when the Anglo-French Commission dealing with the New Hebrides is to meet; whether amendments of the labour regulations will be made; and, if so, on what specific points.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether in any future negotiations with the French Government about the New Hebrides Convention, or in any instructions which may be issued to British officials, the suggestions made by the Prime Minister of Australia, in his despatch of the 13th June, 1906, for the better protection of the indentured labourers, will be fully considered by His Majesty's Government; and whether special consideration will be given to those sections of the Convention which deal with the engagement of women and children, the hours of labour, the rate of wages, and the conditions of repatriation.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to both parts of the last Question of the hon. Member for the Newbury Division is in the affirmative. But I may point out that the Anglo-French Committee which is shortly to meet is not intended to deal with the Convention generally, but only to discuss certain details of working of the Joint Court. I may add, with regard to the last part of the Question, that it must be some time before any licences at all can be issued under the Convention, and before any such licences are issued it will be made quite clear by the instructions given to the British authorities that the points indicated in the Question will be thoroughly safeguarded as regards all licences issued by them. His Majesty's Government have already communicated with the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific with regard to the appointment of sufficient labour inspectors to ensure that abuses do not arise as regards indentured labour employed by subjects under British jurisdiction after licences have been issued.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Will the right hon. Gentleman lay a copy of the instructions on the Table of the House?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I undertake that the instructions issued by the Colonial Office will be laid on the Table of the House.

Egypt—Sugar Royalty on Refined Sugar.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there exists in Egypt and the Soudan, or in either and which of those countries, a royalty on the manufacture, importation, exportation, or sale of refined sugar; if so, what is the amount of such royalty; and whether it is intended to abolish wholly, or to reduce to any and what extent, such royalty and to replace it by one upon unrefined sugar.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of the existence of any such royalty. I will inquire. But, with regard to the latter part of the Question, I must point out that it is for obvious reasons the rule in this country not to announce an intention to alter duties before a decision has been arrived at, and the same reasons would, I assume, be equally applicable to Egypt.

Egyptian Pharmacy Laws.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing that under the new Pharmacy Law of Egypt no power of search or seizure is given, he will advise the Egyptian Government to amend the law so as to create such powers as regards natives, who form the great majority of the illicit vendors of poisons.

SIR EDWARD GREY: It is not a case in which His Majesty's Government can interfere with the discretion of the Egyptian Government.

Canadian Tariffs—Sir Richard Cartwright's Statement.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether his attention has been called to the statement of Sir Richard Cartwright, acting Prime Minister of Canada in the absence of Sir Wilfred Laurier, made in the Canadian Senate on 11th April, as to the negotiations it was proposed to conduct immediately after the Colonial

Conference to bring into force the Canadian intermediate tariff with certain foreign countries; will he state what are the foreign countries in question, and whether the negotiations would be conducted through the Foreign Office, whether the conclusion of such treaties on the basis of the intermediate tariff would automatically diminish the value of the British preference; and whether such negotiations would in any way bind the action of Canada in extending further preference to the United Kingdom.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not yet seen a report of the speech referred to, and am not aware what are the countries in question. The negotiations with Foreign Powers would, of course, be conducted through the proper channels in a manner agreed upon between the Canadian Government and His Majesty's Government. The application of the intermediate tariff would reduce, *pro tanto*, the preference granted to British goods; but the grant of the intermediate tariff to any foreign country would not, apparently, prevent the Canadian Government from altering the British preferential tariff at any time.

Metz Smallpox Outbreak.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can give any information about an alleged epidemic of smallpox at Metz which began last July, has assumed alarming proportions, has seriously affected trade and industry, and has caused the usual Eastertide festivities to be abandoned; can he say if the population at Metz is protected by vaccination and re-vaccination with the same thoroughness as the rest of the German empire; and, if he has not this information, will he send a special commission to inquire and report.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information other than that supplied to me by the hon. Member. His Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin would, no doubt, ask the German authorities to facilitate any inquiry which competent British authorities may desire to make independently in the interests of medical science, but I have not been advised that the occasion is one which requires the appointment of a special commission by His Majesty's Government.

Duty on Cocoa.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the duty payable on raw cocoa is from 2s. 3d. to 8s. 6d. per cwt. less than the duty charged on the product of the same quantity of raw material if imported in a manufactured state.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): An infinite number of combinations of cocoa with other ingredients may be made, and it is therefore impossible to state the exact amount of advantage which may be derived by a manufacturer in this country as compared with a foreign importer. The matter is a complicated one and cannot be dealt with within the limits of a Parliamentary Question and Answer; but, so far as the data which I have enables me to make a calculation, there is an advantage of about 2s. 3d. in favour of the home manufacturer of cocoa powder upon each hundredweight of cocoa beans dealt with, while, in the case of chocolate confectionery of various kinds, there is a similar and often greater advantage, which may, as regards some classes of goods, even reach the higher figure quoted. On the other hand, there is no drawback upon the export of cocoa manufactures.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will lay upon the Table the Report of the Chairman of the Board of Customs, dated 5th October, 1904, on the working of the cocoa and chocolate duties.

MR. ASQUITH: The Paper referred to is a confidential Memorandum prepared for Departmental purposes. I am not prepared to lay it on the Table.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that although the Paper is headed "Confidential" as is every Report by the Chairman of of the Board of Customs to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was quite prepared to lay it on the Table if desired.

MR. ASQUITH: I think it would be a very bad precedent, and I do not intend to set it.

Imported Colonial Spirit.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether imported Colonial spirit for methylating is subject to an adverse differential treatment to the extent of 5d. as compared with Home spirit; and, if so, what is the reason for such differential treatment.

MR. ASQUITH: Colonial spirit, like all imported spirit, is subjected to a Customs Duty which exceeds the Excise Duty on British spirit by 4d. a gallon in the case of rum and brandy, and by 5d. in the case of other spirit. The reason for the difference between the Customs and Excise Duties is that the Excise Duty represents only a part of the total burden imposed on British spirit. It does not cover that portion of the burden which results from revenue restrictions on the manufacture of spirit, and, as this portion of the burden has to be borne by British spirit, whatever the purpose for which it may be used, equality of treatment requires that imported spirit should pay the difference between the two duties, whatever the purpose for which it may be used. Accordingly, imported spirit used for methylation is charged the difference, which on Colonial spirit would be 4d. in the case of rum or brandy, and 5d. in case of other spirit.

Duty on Tobacco.

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the duty payable on unmanufactured tobacco is considerably less than the duty charged on the product of the same quantity of raw material if imported in a manufactured state as cigarettes or cigars.

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir. It has always been held that cigars cannot be manufactured in this country to compete with foreign cigars, and that the additional duty is, therefore, not a protective duty, but a luxury tax. The principle was extended to cigarettes by my immediate predecessor as Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire, who, if I remember rightly, argued the case for the extension upon purely free trade grounds.

MR. DAVID MACIVER: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, as regards the kind of tobacco ordinarily consumed by working men, the amount claimed by the Exchequer in respect of Customs Duty largely exceeds the value of the article; and whether, in the case of a threepenny packet of tobacco such as working men ordinarily smoke, the Customs Duty now collected amounts to about 2½d. the actual value of the tobacco being only about one halfpenny.

MR ASQUITH: Yes, Sir.

Anthrax.

MR. JOWETT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that during the six months ending 20th March last there were fifty-four cases of anthrax reported to his office, fourteen of which were fatal, and that in eight of the fifty-four cases his officers have failed to ascertain the kind of material upon which the person attacked had been engaged, he can see his way to make such arrangements as will in future enable him to inform himself as to the materials which have carried the infection.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I understand the hon. Member refers to some statistics of anthrax with which I recently furnished him. In the eight cases in which a return was made of "material not ascertained," the reference intended was to the material by which the infection was actually conveyed, and not to the material on which the worker was engaged. It is sometimes impossible—especially in the case of miscellaneous occupations such as that of dock labourer, carter or the like, in which six out of the eight cases occurred—to trace the source of the infection; a mere entry of the material on which the worker had been engaged would not serve any useful purpose and might be actually misleading. Every effort, of course, is made by the Medical Inspector of Factories to trace the source of infection in each case, but it is difficult to see what further arrangements, especially in the case of miscellaneous employments such as those mentioned, can be made to ensure a knowledge of the particular material which has carried the infection. I should add that the figures quoted by the hon. Member refer to a period of nearly nine months, and not six as stated in the question.

MR. JOWETT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in regard to all future cases of anthrax which occur at seed-crushing, oil-extracting, and bag-making works, he will endeavour to ascertain the kind of material from which the bags used in seed-crushing and oil-extraction operations have been made and, in the case of bag-making works, what materials are being used.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, this will be done.

Birmingham Betting Prosecution.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that on Friday, 12th April, a soldier, by name Joseph Latham, on furlough from India, was arrested in Birmingham for handing two papers to a man, who was not a bookmaker but a greengrocer, and that this soldier was marched through the streets between two policemen, although he was in His Majesty's uniform; and will he state what reparation has been made, considering that the stipendiary dismissed the case.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed that Latham was found giving two packets containing money and names of horses to a well-known bookmaker whom the police were watching for the purpose of taking proceedings under the Street Betting Act of last session, and that he was thereupon arrested and charged under the Act. He was not in uniform at the time. The magistrate dismissed the charge on the ground that Latham was possibly an innocent agent. I see no reason to think that he has any claim to compensation.

Aliens.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give the number of aliens who have arrived in this country in batches of nineteen or less, and have thus escaped examination, during the last six months; how many vessels have been concerned in bringing these people; and what is their classification according to nationality.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am unable to give the information asked as regards the present year, as the statistics for the last three months are not yet fully tabulated. I have, however, extracted from the complete figures for 1906, which are being prepared for publication, those relating to the last six months of that year. They are as follows:—Between 1st July and 31st December, 1906, 4,894 non-immigrant ships—i.e., ships bringing not more than twenty alien steerage passengers—brought a total of 66,636 alien passengers. After deducting cabin and exempted second-class passengers and transmigrants, there remain 11,502 alien passengers brought on non-immigrant ships. Deducting further (1) those who stated they were proceeding to a destination outside the United Kingdom, (2) those who held return tickets to the Continent, and (3) seamen, there is a total of 6,567 alien passengers on non-immigrant ships who may be said to have escaped examination by arriving on such ships. The nationalities of the 6,567 aliens were as follows:—Russians and Poles, 2,266; French, 1,691; Germans, 773; Dutch, 336; Scandinavians, 299; Italians, 267; Austrians, 240; Spaniards, 206; Swiss, 140; Belgians, 133; United States, 64; others, 152.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has any information that persons who have been rejected under the Aliens Act are brought into this country in small batches of nineteen or less; if not, whether he will cause inquiry to be made upon this subject; and whether any steps are taken to ascertain if persons rejected on account of contagious disease attempt to enter the country after rejection.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I have no information to the effect suggested in the first part of the Question: and as to the last two sentences I do not see what steps I can take in the direction indicated, as there is no power to inspect alien steerage passengers on non-immigrant ships.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of aliens landed in Great Britain during the past twelve months, and the number of skilled artisans who have emigrated from Great Britain to foreign countries during the same period.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The total number of aliens who landed in the United Kingdom during the twelve months ended 31st December, 1906, was 560,368. This total includes aliens of every description, irrespective of the purposes for which they may have come to this country. The total number of skilled workmen recorded as leaving the United Kingdom during 1906 for non-European foreign countries was 38,600, of whom 23,245 were of British nationality. The number leaving for European countries cannot be stated.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Will the Government take steps to prevent the landing of these aliens to this enormous extent, and thus enable the British workman to find employment in his own country?

*MR. GLADSTONE referred the hon. Member to his previous Answer as throwing light on the figures last given.

*MAJOR SEELY asked if the right hon. Gentleman, in view of the extraordinarily small number of aliens permanently remaining in this country, the great cost of administering the Act, and the hardships imposed by it on refugees, would not consider the desirability of repealing the Act altogether?

[No Answer was returned.]

Vaccination Exemption at Bradford.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the case of Mr. Vincent Ward, an applicant for a vaccination exemption certificate at the West Riding Court, Bradford, when Dr. W. H. Ellis, a local practitioner, presided, and refused the application; if it is permissible for a medical practitioner to adjudicate in these cases; if his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. Rawson, the magistrate's clerk, that the question was whether vaccination would injure the child; and if he will take steps to remove Mr. Rawson.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am making inquiry into this case, and I will let the hon. Member know the result, but I may point out that I have, of course, no control over a magistrate's clerk.

Poor Prisoners Defence Act.

MR. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has, as promised, communicated with Mr. Wallace, K.C. the Chairman of the London County Sessions, with regard to the latter's expression of opinion that the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act was rendered practically inoperative because legal aid could not be granted unless a prisoner disclosed a defence before the committing magistrate; and what reply the Chairman has given to his communication.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have consulted Mr. Wallace, and have received from him a suggestion for the Amendment of the Rules under the Act. I will bring his proposal to the notice of the Attorney-General by whom the Rules are made.

Company Subscriptions to Election Funds.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that the dock companies assisted in financing the London Municipal Society; whether he will make an inquiry into the extent and circumstances of the subscription; and whether he will take any steps, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent the recurrence of subscriptions by companies created by Act of Parliament to associations which take an active part in contested elections.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I have been in communication with the London and India Docks Company, the Surrey Commercial Dock Company, and the Millwall Dock Company on the subject of my hon. friend's

Question. I have received replies from these companies to the effect that they have subscribed, the London and India Docks Company, £100, the Surrey Commercial Dock Company, £100, and the Millwall Dock Company, £21, to the funds of the London Municipal Society. These replies, which are too lengthy for me to read here, but which will be printed with the Votes, state in all three cases, that the Directors were not influenced by any political motive.

The letters were as follows:—

"London and India Docks Company,
"Dock House, 109, Leadenhall Street,
"London, 18th April, 1907.
H. 4547.

"Sir,

"The Directors have had before them your letter of the 12th instant. They have no objection to stating that they subscribed £100 to the funds of the London Municipal Society in December last, and they are advised that under the judgment given by the Court of Appeal on the 19th November, 1906, the contribution was a perfectly legal one.

"Their reason for giving the subscription was to aid the endeavours of the London Municipal Society to return members at the recent municipal and guardian elections pledged to economy in local administration.

"The Company, like all proprietors of industrial undertakings in and near London, have suffered grievously from the excessive local rates levied upon them. Rates have been increasing for many years past, and there has been no remedy open to the Company in the municipality itself, for although they pay a large proportion of the rates in every locality in which their docks are situated, they have absolutely no voice in the election of the persons who spend their money.

"The only course open to the Company, therefore, is to support reputable organisations which are found to educate voters as to the peril to them of the increase of municipal burdens, and to expose the mismanagement of particular local institutions. Acting on this principle, my directors have subscribed to the West Ham Borough Alliance and the Poplar Borough Alliance. Both of these alliances have been remarkably successful in the work, and it may be within the knowledge of the Board of Trade that they have been active agents in bringing to light the notorious scandals which have been the subject of recent official inquiry in these two boroughs: indeed in the case of the inquiry into the administration of the Poor Law at Poplar, the alliance was officially recognised by the Local Government Board's representative as the body chiefly responsible for proving the charges made against the guardians. In Poplar alone, as a result of the action taken by the alliance, there will be savings in expenditure at the rate of £70,000 a year, which will be shared by the whole of the ratepayers of the borough.

"It was because of the success achieved at Poplar and West Ham that the Directors welcomed the efforts of the London Municipal Society to apply to those matters in which London as a whole is concerned, the same reforming energy which has been applied locally at Poplar and West Ham.

"The Directors observe that it has been charged against the London Municipal Society that it is a political organisation. No ground for such a charge is to be found either in the rules or the statement of objects of the society. No political test for membership is imposed, and as a fact, there are persons belonging to both the Unionist and Liberal Parties amongst its members, and on the council is Sir F. Schuster, who was the Liberal candidate for the City of London at the last general election.

"The Directors, amongt whom are adherents of both sides of politics, would certainly not continue their support to the society if they had any reason to believe that its aims were political, but no evidence has come before them to show that there has been any conduct on the part of its managers which indicates a departure from the spirit of its constitution.

"I am, etc.,
"(Signed) J. G. BROODBANK,
"Secretary.

"The Assistant Secretary,
"Harbour Department,
"Board of Trade."

"Surrey Commercial Dock Company,
"Secretary's Office,
"106, Fenchurch Street,
"London, E.C.,
"18th April, 1907.

"Sir,

"I have submitted to my directors your letter of the 12th instant, and, in reply to your enquiry as to whether or not my company have made any subscription to the London Municipal Society, I am instructed to state that in November last my company subscribed the sum of £100 to the funds of the Society.

"In making this contribution my directors were not influenced by any political considerations. They were solely concerned, in the interests of their shareholders, to ensure the election of persons pledged to the economical administration of local affairs, with a view to obtaining some alleviation of the burden of excessive and increasing rates from which my company, in common with other industrial undertakings, has suffered severely.

"Whilst this company contribute a very large proportion of the rates in the district in which their property is situated, they have no part in the election of the members of the bodies who make the rates, and have absolutely no control over the expenditure.

"In these circumstances my directors, believing the London Municipal Society to be a non-political organisation, as evidenced by its constitution rules and membership, thought it right to support the society, whose objects appeared to them legitimate and desirable.

"I am, etc.,
(Signed) "P. H. CULLIS,
"Secretary.

"The Assistant Secretary,
"Harbour Department,
"Board of Trade."

"Millwall Dock Company,
"Dock House, 1, Railway Place,
"Fenchurch Street, E.C.,
"London, 17th April, 1907.

"Sir,

"In reply to your letter of the 12th instant, I am instructed to say that a donation of twenty guineas has been given to the funds of the London Municipal Society by this company.

"In response to your invitation to offer observations on the subject, I am further instructed by my directors (who represent both shades of political opinion) to say that they were induced to make this donation by the success which attended their efforts to expose the wasteful and extravagant policy of the Guardians in Poplar, through the medium of the Popular Borough Municipal Alliance, to whose funds an amount of £125 has been contributed from time to time by my Board.

"My directors had noted with apprehension the steady growth in the Poplar general rates, as shown in the following table:—

1897 - -	7s. 8d.	in the £
1898 - -	7s. 10d.	,,
1899 - -	8s. 7½d.	,,
1900 - -	9s. 1½d.	,,
1901 - -	9s. 4d.	,,
1902 - -	9s. 7d.	,,
1903 - -	9s. 8d.	,,
1904 - -	9s. 10d.	,,
1905 - -	11s. 8d.	,,
1906 - -	11s. 9d.	,,
1907 at the rate of	10s. 7d.	,,

after the Poplar Inquiry.

"My directors were unable to secure any redress from the burden, as they had no voice whatever in the disposition of the funds to which they were large contributors, until the Poplar Borough Municipal Alliance secured the assistance of the Local Government Board, who held an inquiry into the expenditure and operations of the Guardians at Poplar with the result shown above in 1907.

"My directors are fully satisfied that in helping to promote this public inquiry they were acting in the interests of their proprietors and of the general body of ratepayers in the borough of Poplar.

"Encouraged by the distinct benefits which resulted from the efforts of the Poplar alliance my directors had no hesitation in contributing to the funds of the London Municipal Society, and did so in the hope and belief that the society would direct its efforts to putting a stop to the heavy expenditure of municipal bodies who, in the opinion of my directors, do not sufficiently take into consideration the burden that is being placed upon public and other companies through their extravagance.

"I am further desired to say that my directors take strong exception to the suggestions which have been publicly advanced that such monies have been contributed for political purposes; their one and only object has been to effectually counteract the alarming tendency in recent years to increase the local rates.

"I am, etc.,
(Signed) "W. S. T. Biggs,
"Secretary.

"The Assistant Secretary,"
"Board of Trade,
"Harbour Department,
"7, Whitehall Gardens, S.W."

AN HON. MEMBER suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should inquire into the action of the Glasgow Corporation in spending the ratepayers' money in promoting the Land Taxation Bill.

Coal Export.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what was the total quantity of coal exported from the United Kingdom in 1906, including the estimated coal equivalent of coke and patent fuel.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The total quantity was 76,788,179 tons, if bunker coal is included. Excluding bunker coal the total was 58,197,966 tons.

Export Returns.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the incompleteness of the figures relating to exported manufactures in the Returns of Imperial trade given in the Statistical Abstract; why leather goods are represented in that Return as the solitary manufactured export of the British Empire; and whether he will take steps to complete the statement in future issues by the inclusion of figures relating to other manufactured commodities.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The table in the British Empire Abstract to which the right hon. Member alludes was originally intended to show the trade in certain staple foodstuffs and raw materials between the British Empire as a whole and foreign countries. The classification introduced in the most recent issue of the abstract under the three headings, food, raw materials, and manufactured articles, has had the unintended effect of giving a solitary position to leather in this table which, I admit, now gives a misleading impression. I shall be very glad to discuss with the right hon. Gentleman how far it is practicable to include particulars with regard to a few of the more important groups of manufactured articles, having due regard to the great labour involved in compiling the details and the want of uniformity in the Colonial trade accounts.

Commercial Corruption.

MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, consequent upon the provisions of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906, and the action of various trade associations in making public the provisions thereof, offers of secret commission to agents are now being extensively circulated in this country from firms writing from abroad, the offer in some cases amounting to a very large percentage on the amount of the order sent to the foreign firms in question; and whether he will give the matter his attention at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: My attention has already been called to this matter and a notice was published in the Board of Trade Journal for 21st February last in which it was pointed out that the acceptance of any such offers from foreign firms renders agents in this country liable to penalties under the Act. I trust that the efforts which I understand are being made by various associations of British traders to put an end to the practice, will be successful.

Patent Law.

MR. MOND (Chester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state whether Clause 10 of the Bill to amend the Law relating to Patents and Designs is at variance with any treaty, agreement, or engagement with any foreign country or British Possession; and, if so, what foreign countries or British Possessions.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am advised that the provisions of the clause would not be at variance with any existing, treaty, agreement, or arrangement.

North Eastern Signal Boxes at Hull.

Mr. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that the hours of duty of the gate signalmen at the St. George's road and Hawthorne avenue level crossings, Hull, North Eastern Railway, are at present six turns of twelve hours' day duty and seven turns of twelve hours' night duty per fortnight, without any clear Sunday off duty; whether any inquiry has been made under the Hours Act, 1893; and, if so, can he say what conclusion has been arrived at.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Inquiry has been made in this matter, and the railway company have arranged that the gatemen concerned are to have a clear interval of twenty-four hours off duty on alternate Sundays.

Emigration.

Captain FABER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, looking at the fact that the Emigration Returns for Great Britain, which is a free trade country, amounted to 453,000 in 1904, and in Germany, which is protectionist, to only 28,000, and also looking at the destitution which exists at Woolwich owing to want of work, the Government can see their way to legislation which will safeguard our manufacturing industries, and so give more employment to those who wish for it.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): The figures mentioned in the Question do not seem to be comparable, for whilst those relating to the United Kingdom represent the total number of passengers leaving this country for places out of Europe in 1904, and include foreign passengers and also British and Irish passengers, whether emigrants or not, the figures relating to Germany appear only to include such Germans as can be stated to be leaving for settlement abroad. The promotion of the legislation which would be necessary to give effect to the suggestion in the last part of the Question would not be a matter within the province of my Department, but I should have thought that the views of the present Government on the subject of any legislation having protection for its object were sufficiently well known.

Captain FABER: Has the right hon. Gentleman no remedy to suggest?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: There are many remedies suggested for the unemployed difficulty, but the most unsatisfactory is protection.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us the figures for England which are comparable to the 28,000 for Germany?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: If the right hon. Gentleman will give me notice, I shall be pleased to get the best available figures.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Is it not the case that the emigrants for England number 34 per 10,000, and for Germany only 9 per 10,000.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said he was not disposed to accept those Returns. There were many other things to be taken into account.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): Has the right hon. Gentleman any figures showing the ratio to population?

[No Answer was returned.]

Derby Union and Vaccination.

Mr. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he is aware that Dr. Johnson, one of the Local Government Board inspectors, has instructed the vaccination officer of the Derby Union to recommence prosecutions under the Vaccination Acts; whether he is aware that there are between 25,000 and 30,000 children unvaccinated in Derby, and if the parents of all those will also be prosecuted, and, if so, will those of the longest standing be proceeded against first and continued on in that order; and whether Dr. Johnson's action has the sanction of the Local Government Board.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: A new vaccination officer has recently been appointed at Derby, and Dr. Johnson acted properly in advising him as to his duties, one of which is to take all reasonable steps to put the Vaccination Acts in force. I am aware that there are a large number of unvaccinated children in Derby. It is not contemplated that proceedings will have to be taken in all these cases. I understand that Dr. Johnson told the vaccination officer that he should use all possible means of persuasion to induce parents to comply with the law, and that if this failed, he should institute proceedings in a limited number of cases with a view to securing its observance. The selection of the cases would rest with the vaccination officer.

Poor Law Expenditure.

Mr. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the total expenditure incurred by all local bodies, excluding that on Poor Law, for the financial year 1906, or for the financial year 1905 if the figures for the former year are not available.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The figures for the financial year 1904–5 are not quite ready. Those for the year 1903–4 show that the total expenditure of all the local authorities in England and Wales, excluding expenditure on the relief of the poor and purposes connected therewith, was £114,573,229, inclusive of £29,407,543 defrayed out of loans.

Mr. WALROND: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the total number of municipal officers and employees of all grades, excluding Poor Law, and the total amount of salaries, wages, gratuities, etc., received by these for the year 1906, or for 1905 if the figures for the former year are not available.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The Returns furnished to the Local Government Board do not give the information desired by the hon. Member. A Parliamentary Return will, however, shortly be published, showing the number of persons employed in November last by the London County Council and by the councils of County Boroughs and Metropolitan Boroughs. The remuneration of the persons employed by local authorities is often merged in the Returns in the expenditure on the purposes and undertakings in which the persons have been engaged; but the Local Taxation Returns give some particulars as to the salaries and superannuation allowances of the officers of local authorities, and I will send the hon. Member a copy of the last published summary of these Returns.

Death from Vaccination at Harringay.

*Mr. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if W. F. Hunt, of 64, Duckett Road, Harringay, has complained to the Local Government Board that his child, Olive Hunt, has died from the effects of vaccination, and has applied to the Local Government Board, in a letter dated 18th February, 1907, to be allowed to see a copy of the Report of the case prepared by Dr. Fletcher for the Local Government Board; and if he will order a copy of the Report to be supplied to Mr. Hunt.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I received the letter referred to, but, as I stated in reply to a previous Question on this subject by my hon. friend, the Report of Dr. Fletcher was made for my information and is a confidential document. Consequently I could not supply a copy to Mr. Hunt.

*Mr. LUPTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me to make a copy?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Certainly not.

*Mr. LUPTON: Why is it when the quality of the staff which he supplies is impugned he keeps the reports secret?

[No Answer was returned.]

Indian Mail Contracts.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether a new postal contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company is under consideration; and, if so, whether an accelerated despatch can be arranged for under which the Indian mail will ordinarily arrive in London not later than Friday morning.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The question of future arrangements for the Eastern mail service is under consideration; but I am not at present in a position to make any announcement on the subject.

Education Bill.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education when he will introduce the Bill to authorise the expenditure of public money upon the erection of new public elementary schools.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The form which this legislation will take is still under consideration, and I am not in a position to say when it will be introduced.

Royston Head Teachership.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the grounds given by the West Riding education authority for their refusal to appoint Mr. Milnes to the head teachership of the Royston school are entirely based upon a report by the sub-committee; whether he is aware that the sub-committee consisted of two members with their clerk, not specially experienced in dealing with children or in testing the efficiency of teachers; that the total duration of their visit to Sharlston school was forty-five minutes, of which not more than fifteen were spent with the children in the school, and that not more than six questions in geography and mental arithmetic were asked of the children; and whether he will see that evidence based on such a visit of inspection shall not be allowed by the Board to outweigh the favourable reports of many Government Inspectors extending over many years, and the strong recommendation of Mr. Milne's appointment made by the Inspector specially sent by the Board to inquire into this dispute.

MR. MCKENNA: I am unable to say whether the local education authority's decision was entirely based on the sub-committee's report, but as the sub-committee appointed representatives with the special object of visiting the school at which Mr. Milnes is employed, I have no doubt considerable weight was given to their report. According to my information the sub-committee did not consist of two members and their clerk, as stated by the hon. Gentleman. Two members of the sub-committee, accompanied by the county council's inspector of schools, visited the school in question. I am informed that at least forty-five minutes was spent with the children themselves, besides the fifteen or twenty minutes spent in the school in discussion with the head master before the children assembled; I have no information as to the number of questions asked. As I have previously stated, the jurisdiction of the Board in these cases is strictly limited to deciding whether the local education authority withheld their consent on educational grounds and no question of one report outweighing another can therefore arise.

MR. LANE-FOX: Arising out of that Answer may I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman's attention has been drawn to the letter written by the chairman of this education committee, and appearing in the *Yorkshire Post* on Monday last, and whether that letter is consistent with the statement that the appointment of Mr. Milnes was refused on educational grounds?

MR. MCKENNA: Yes, Sir. My attention has been called to that letter, and it appears to me that the strict construction of that letter does not agree with the statement made by the local education authority.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E): May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman conceives that the duty of the Education Department is fulfilled the moment it receives the statement of the local education authority that they had acted on educational grounds, or whether he considers they ought to ascertain whether that statement correctly represents the facts?

MR. MCKENNA: I do think it is the duty of the Board of Education to inquire whether the statement does correctly represent the facts.

*MR. GEORGE FABER (York): May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is still prepared to repeat the Answer given in the House last week that there was no shadow of doubt that the appointment was refused on educational grounds?

Mr. McKENNA: I have no doubt the educational authority refused the appointment on educational grounds.

Non-Provided Schools.

Lord R. CECIL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education how many of the local education authorities in any of the years 1904, 1905, and 1906 spent on the non-provided schools in their districts not more than the amounts received by way of grants in respect of such schools.

Mr. McKENNA: I have no information as to the sums spent by local education authorities upon individual schools, and, as I stated, in answer to my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil, on Monday. separate accounts for the whole cost of individual schools, so far as I am aware, are not usually kept.

Lord R. CECIL: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman obtain information, not in respect of individual schools, but in respect of the whole body of non-provided schools in each district?

Mr. McKENNA: No, Sir, I am not able to do that.

Lord R. CECIL: Can it not be obtained by means of a circular from the Education Department?

Mr. McKENNA: No, Sir, we have no authority to demand such information from the local authorities. In fact they do not keep their account in such a way as to admit of their giving it.

Pall Mall Improvement.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what sums are now being expended upon the repair and redecoration of the buildings in Pall Mall recently occupied by the War Office.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): I have been asked to reply to this Question. One portion of these buildings will be occupied for the present by the staff of the Director of Barrack Construction, for which there is no accommodation in the new War Office. A sum of £700 has been expended on work for this occupation. Another portion will temporarily be used by the Office of Woods during the building of new offices for that Department; but the cost of preparation cannot yet be given. The remainder of the old War Office premises in this block has reverted to the Land Revenue as Crown property at the disposal of the Office of Woods; and nothing has been expended on it on repair or redecoration since it was vacated.

Grand Committee Rooms.

Mr. NIELD: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works which rooms are to be allocated for the use of Grand Committees in addition to the large Committee room now used for that purpose; and what alterations are to be made for the convenience of the Press, the public, and the Members serving upon the Committees.

Mr. HARCOURT: The large Committee room off Westminster Hall will be available, and I am considering improvements in its seating accommodation.

Vote on Account of Provision for New Schools.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury on what date it was decided to exclude from the Vote on Account the proportion of the sum of £100,000 to be voted as special provision for new schools.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): No special decision was necessary, as it would be contrary to the rules governing Votes on Account to include therein any provision for a new service.

Prescot Land Tax Commissioners.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that the Land Tax Commissioners appointed under the Act of 1906 for the Prescot district of the county of Lancaster were summoned to attend a meeting at Prescot on the 11th instant to appoint the collectors for the ensuing year; that twenty-five gentlemen from Liverpool accordingly attended at the hour named; that on arrival they were informed by the clerk that there was no business to transact; and that two meetings had been held previously in March and April at which the clerk himself and the collectors were appointed, and to which the Land Tax Commissioners in question were never summoned; whether these meetings and the business transacted thereat are valid; and what steps His Majesty's Government intend to take to secure the proper working of the Act of 1906 and the due summoning of the Land Tax Commissioners as prescribed by that Act.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The incident referred to appears to have been due to some misapprehension on the part of the clerk. I understand that another meeting has now been held at which satisfactory explanations were given and an amicable settlement of the difficulty effected.

Second Class Inspectors of Inland Revenue.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, can he say how many examinations have been held since 1st January, 1897, of supervisors of Inland Revenue, for the position of second-class inspectors of Inland Revenue; the dates on which the several examinations were held; the number of supervisors summoned to attend each examination; the number who actually attended; and the number passed at each examination.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Answer to this Question involves a great number of figures which, however, I can communicate privately to the hon. Member if he desires.

Population, Revenue, and Expenditure.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will cause to be issued a similar memorandum respecting the progress of population, revenue and expenditure, to that contained in Parliamentary Paper, No. 163, of Session 1896, bringing the figures down to 31st March, 1907, and excluding, if needs be, the figures for the years of war taxation and expenditure, which, to a certain extent, vitiate comparisons.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Memorandum to which my hon. friend refers contains a great mass of detail, much of which would not now probably have any very great general interest, but I will consider whether a simpler statement can be prepared embracing the more important points, and bringing the information down to the present time.

Export of Horses to the Continent.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if it has been possible for the Department to act upon any of the suggestions of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals as detailed by the deputation thereof, received upon 15th January 1907, in the matter of the export trade to the Continent of old and decrepit British horses, so as to minimise as far as possible the suffering and cruelty involved in the traffic.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): The suggestions made are receiving careful attention, and we have called for reports on the subject from our inspectors, but I am not in a position at present to make any further statement in the matter.

Anthrax.

MR. JOWETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, on all future occasions when an outbreak of anthrax among cattle is reported, he will inquire whether oil cake has been used in feeding the infected cattle; and, if so, whether bags made from dangerous wool have been utilised at any stage in the manufacture of such oil cake, and, also, where bags of the description referred to have been used, the kind of material from which the bags have been manufactured.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It is already our practice, when anthrax is reported, to ascertain whether artificial feeding stuffs, including oil cake, have been used. Where necessary, samples of the feeding stuff, and of the bags in which it is contained are taken for experimental investigation. Up to the present, infection has not been definitely traced in any case to the material of which the bags are made.

Dumbarton Sewerage.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Local Government Board in effect ordered the conversion of the domestic sanitary system of the burgh of Dumbarton, as stated by the Provost before a Parliamentary Committee on 8th May, 1906; whether he is aware that the conversion referred to has resulted in the domestic sewage of over 20,000 inhabitants being discharged into the tidal pools of the River Leven without purification of any kind; and whether, in view of the condition of the river, he will insist upon such proceedings being taken as will render the conversion of the sewage system harmless to the natural purity of the river.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): In 1903 the Local Government Board pressed the local authority to take steps to remove certain nuisances. I understand that the local authority have also on hand the extension of all outlets into the river so as to prevent the deposit of sewage on the shores above low water mark. When these have been completed it is believed that a great improvement will be effected in the condition of the river bed.

Mr. R. DUNCAN: Is the Government aware, as a reason for pressing action in this matter, that the City of Glasgow is expending about £2,000,000 sterling for the purification of the River Clyde, and that the neglect of the purification of the River Leven may render this expense nugatory?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am aware of that.

British Fishermen on Foreign Trawlers.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that a number of Grimsby fishermen have been summoned to appear at Elgin; that such prosecution has been instituted by the Scottish Fishery Board for alleged contravention of the local Scottish fishery regulations in vogue in the Moray Firth; and, if so, whether he is aware that these men occupied subordinate positions on board of the trawlers and took service on board with the sole desire of earning an honest livelihood, and that it has always been recognised by them that, being engaged on these boats with a captain superior to them, they were amply protected from interference under the Scottish regulations, and that the vessels on which the defendants were engaged were none of them within the three mile limit, some of them being from ten to twelve miles from low-water mark; and whether, in view of all these circumstances, he will use his best endeavours to have such prosecution set aside.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The facts regarding intended prosecutions are as stated by the hon. Member. The policy of the Government to proceed against British subjects engaged in illegal trawling has been already intimated to the House, and I am unable to adopt the course suggested in the Question.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): May I ask if the right hon. Gentleman knows that the men mentioned in the Question were heavily fined for being employed on foreign trawlers?

Mr. SINCLAIR: They were fined, not for being found on foreign trawlers, but for breaking the laws of their own country.

Sir GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the persons fined yesterday were employed on foreign trawlers?

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is so, and the responsibility rests with those who employed them.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: May I ask whether it is the intention of the Government to allow English fishermen to be heavily fined and imprisoned for doing what foreign fishermen have the right to do?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): The intention of the Government is to compel obedience to the law.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY: Is it an illegal act for an Englishman to serve on a foreign ship?

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think it is, but it is an illegal act for him to go into the Moray Firth and break the law of Scotland.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY: But foreign trawlers are doing that daily, and these men are employed on foreign trawlers.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: May I ask if the House is to understand that the Government is in favour of giving preference to foreign over English fishermen?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Board of Works.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the statement made from the bench by the chief magistrate of the city of Dublin as to the character of the Board of Works, which was not refuted by the Board, will he ask the Board of Works why this matter was allowed to pass unnoticed, having regard to their minute dealing with the article in the *Freeman's Journal* of the 16th November last, relative to their incompetency and the bigotry of Mr. Williams.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Board of Works inform me that they have no knowledge of the statement alleged to have been made by the chief magistrate of the city of Dublin as to the character of the Board of Works. In any case it is not the custom of Government Departments to reply to attacks made on them by outside bodies, or individuals, but it is within their discretion to take such steps as may appear necessary to maintain the discipline of their Department.

Carrickfergus Town Lands.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that certain landowners at Carrickfergus, county Antrim, are endeavouring to arrange the purchase of the head-rents paid to the town Commissioners of Carrickfergus; whether he is aware that these lands were vested by Royal Charter from Queen Elizabeth in the town commissioners, and were inalienable; that under the Charter the occupiers or leaseholders cannot lease, let, or sell the lands without the sanction of the council; and whether inquiries will be made to ascertain if these are Crown lands or municipal or private property.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool Exchange): I am informed by the town clerk of Carrickfergus that one application only has been received from a landowner at Carrickfergus for the purchase of head-rents payable to the town commissioners. The offer was ultimately refused. The lands are vested in the town commissioners by Royal Charter of Queen Elizabeth confirmed by Charters of 7th James I. and 10th James I., but I understand the Charters contain no restriction upon alienation. The former corporation made grants for ever, and leases for long terms of years which did contain clauses restricting alienation, but the urban district council in whom the lands are now vested have been advised by counsel that such clauses when contained in fee-farm grants are inoperative and void. They are, I believe, valid when contained in leases for terms of years, except so far as they are affected by the terms of the Land Act, 1903. I do not see any necessity for an inquiry into the matter, as it has not been suggested that the town commissioners are in any way acting contrary to their duties towards the public.

Irish Post Office Stores Department.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is contemplated to establish a branch of the Controller of Stores Department in Dublin; and, if so, whether the existing storesmen and stores clerks at the local depôts in Cork, Belfast, and Dublin will have the option of being transferred to the new branch as they desire, or is it the intention to import a staff from Great Britain and appoint an Englishman to the control of the new branch at Dublin, in accordance with the usual practice of the Post Office in Ireland nowadays?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: At present the officers in charge of postal stores in

Ireland are under the control of the Secretary in Dublin, and those in charge of telegraph stores are officers of the engineer-in-chief in London. It is intended, on the ground of administrative convenience, to unite the two branches and to place the stores department in Dublin under the control of the Controller of Stores. The details of the rearrangement have not yet been settled, but due regard will be had to the claims of the existing staff.

Welsh Church Commission.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that several members of the Welsh Church Commission have ceased to attend the meetings of that body; whether any member has tendered his resignation; and if he can give an assurance that neither the resignation of members nor the differences that have arisen between members as to the meaning and scope of the reference will delay the Report of the Commission, or postpone the introduction of the promised Disestablishment Bill next session.

MR. REES: I beg at the same time to ask the Prime Minister whether any member or members of the Welsh Church Commission have resigned; and whether any steps can be taken to hasten the proceedings of this Commission, in view of the unanimity of Welsh constituencies upon the subject with which the Commission has to deal.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sorry to say that my hon. friend the Member for Mid-Glamorganshire, together with Professor Jones and Principal Fairbairn have tendered their resignation to the King. I can, of course, give no assurance as to the progress which will be made by a body over which I have no control. But I have no fear that any unnecessary delay will occur.

Irish Licensing Trade.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that Ireland, with a population slightly and wealth largely below that of Scotland, has about 7,000 more public houses; that, owing to the decision in Clitheroe's case, the justices in Ireland have no power to refuse renewals of licences on the ground of there being too many public houses, and that the Licensing Act of 1904 does not apply to Ireland; and will he consider the desirability of immediate legislation on the subject to meet the need of Ireland for reduction of the number of her licensed houses.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The facts as stated in the hon. Member's Question are, I believe, substantially correct. With regard to the last paragraph of the Question I would refer the hon. Member to an Answer I gave him upon this subject on Wednesday last.†

Loans for School Buildings.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of representations that have been made to the Local Government Board in favour of granting longer terms for the repayment of loans contracted by municipal and other authorities for the erection of school buildings, he will arrange for the Local Government Board Vote being taken first on some early Thursday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANERNMAN: I will communicate with my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board, but I understand that there are difficulties in the way of taking this Vote on an early Thursday.

Standing Order 18.

MR. NIELD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the amount of work which, under the proposed amendment of the Standing Orders, will devolve upon the Standing Committees, he will consider the advisability of amending the Standing Order No. 18 so as to apply its provisions, either wholly or in some modified form, to proceedings before such Committees.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hardly see the connection between the work that will be done by the Standing Committees and the unruly conduct of Members which the hon. Member anticipates. I should have thought that the more work they had to do the less unruly they would be. Should the necessity unhappily arise, I should, however, be prepared to consider the hon. Member's suggestion, but the Standing Order to which he refers is not a very convenient weapon seeing that it broke in the hand of the Minister who was forging it and has remained ever since in a truncated condition.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 753.

Empire Day.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether His Majesty's Government will favourably consider the advisability of ordering the British flag to be hoisted where possible on all Government buildings throughout Great Britain on future Empire days.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have already given this matter my consideration, and I do not think it advisable that any order should be issued with regard to the hoisting of flags on Government buildings on the day in question.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked if there was any objection to the hoisting of the flag on Government buildings on Empire day.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): What is Empire day? How long has it been established?

[No Answer was returned.]

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the distress caused by the discharges from Woolwich Arsenal and Dockyard among the working classes and shopkeepers, he will arrange to take Vote 8, Ordnance Establishment, before the end of this month, so as to afford an opportunity to the House of discussing the whole matter before any further discharges take place.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that the consideration of this Vote would afford no opportunity for discussing the question of these discharges; but in any case the causes of the reduction of the Arsenal Staff are so well known that it seems to me doubtful whether a discussion would be of any benefit. As my right hon. friend the Secretary for War, has informed the House, they are due to general reductions in naval and military expenditure and not to any unusual allocation of Government orders, and everything that legitimately can be done will be done to temper the hardship which they entail.

Indian Budget.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will allot two days to the discussion of the Indian Budget in order to enable the Secretary of State for India to reply to the criticisms and suggestions of hon. Members.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid that in view of the amount of work which has to be got through it may be quite impossible to give more than one full day to the Indian Budget.

MR. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman give us a full instead of a half day as before?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I will do my best.

Malta.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if it is proposed to appoint a civil governor for Malta; and by what department the appointment will be made.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not proposed to alter the present arrangements by which the Governor of Malta is appointed.

The Government and the Lords.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will, before Whitsuntide, make an announcement to the House on the subject of the unfortunate differences which have arisen between the two Houses, mentioned in His Majesty's most Gracious Speech.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hope so, Sir, but I shall be better able to answer the Question in a week's time.

Grand Committees.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is his intention to have official reports made of all proceedings taking place on the four new Grand Committees, and having such reports published for the use and benefit of all Members of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Official Reports in the case of the Proceedings of the House itself, as well as of the Standing Committees, are confined to what is done and do not extend to what is spoken. We do not contemplate any alteration of this practice.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: How will Members of this House be able to gain information as to what takes place upstairs?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In the way they have done in past years.

Chamber of Commerce and the Colonial Premiers.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the resolution passed on the 15th March by the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce to send cordial greetings to the Colonial Premiers and to express the opinion that commercial union throughout the Empire could be most readily and advantageously established on a mutual preferential basis; and whether this resolution, and the other similar resolutions by these chambers, which represent the commerce of the country, will be specially considered by the Government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: All expressions of public opinion that may reach His Majesty's Government will be duly considered.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN stated that the business next week would be, provisionally, the Budget Resolutions on Money, the Army Bill on Tuesday, and the Budget Resolutions or Bill on Wednesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I take it the right hon. Gentleman proposes to follow the ordinary course tonight, and to restrict the Resolutions taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to those necessary for the public service, reserving the general discussion till a later day.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The ordinary practice will be followed.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Everett and Mr. William Johnson; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Lupton and Mr. John Johnson.

Report to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

CONVICTS' DIVORCE BILL.

"To entitle the wives of convicted persons, sentenced to seven years imprisonment and upwards to Divorce," presented by Mr. Bottomley; to be read a second time upon Friday, 26th April, and to be printed. [Bill 162.]

TOWN TENANTS (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Town Tenants in England and Wales," presented by Mr. Walker; supported by Mr. Rendall and Mr. Wedgwood; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 163.]

RIGHTS OF WAY (SCOTLAND) (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend The Local Government (Scotland) Act 1894, with regard to Rights of Way," presented by Mr. Munro Ferguson; supported by Sir Thomas Glen Coats; to be read a second time upon Monday, 29th April, and to be printed. [Bill 164.]

PATENTS AND DESIGNS (CONSOLIDATION) BILL.

"To consolidate the Enactments relating to Patents for Inventions and the Registration of Designs and certain Enactments relating to Trade Marks," presented by Mr. Kearley; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 165.]

HARBOUR AUTHORITIES (IRELAND) BILL.

"To fix and regulate the franchise for the election of the members of Harbour Authorities in Ireland," presented by Mr. Joseph Devlin; supported by Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Kettle, Mr. Mooney, Mr. M'Killop, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th May, and to be printed. [Bill 166.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS.)

Ordered, That the Committee of Ways and Means have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS).

Ordered, That the Proceedings of the Committee of Ways and Means, if under consideration at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House).—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

WAYS AND MEANS (COMMITTEE).

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

THE BUDGET STATEMENT.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): Mr. Emmott, as I am afraid I may have to make a somewhat considerable draft on the patience of the Committee in dealing with the present and the future, I shall content myself, and I will ask the Committee to be content, with a very brief, though, I hope, not wholly perfunctory, review of the past. The financial year which closed on March 31st was, in many ways, a remarkable one. Tried by all the ordinary tests, the trade of the United Kingdom, both at Home and over the sea, has rarely been more active or more flourishing. Nor was this prosperity confined to ourselves. It was shared, in greater or less degree, by almost all the producing countries of the world. To these generally favourable conditions there has been one prominent exception, the market for stocks and securities. Owing to causes of which I shall have to speak later on, there has been, especially in the later part of the year, a monetary stringency which looked at one time as though it were going to put a severe strain on the machinery of credit. It has been, from the financial point of view, in many ways, a year of surprises; and, perhaps, there has been nothing in it, superficially at least, more surprising than that the balance to the credit of the national account, which a year ago I estimated as likely to be somewhere between £300,000 and £400,000, was found, when the account was closed on March 31st, to be no less than £5,399,000. I have been the object of much misdirected congratulation in regard to the unforeseen dimensions of this enormous sum by people who do not understand the vital difference to the Chancellor of the Exchequer between the realised balance of one year and the estimated surplus of the next. Over the former, the realised balance of the past year, unless he chooses to ask Parliament to suspend the law, he has absolutely no control. It goes automatically to the Old Sinking Fund, and can only be legally applied to the redemption of debt; and as, moreover, any substantial excess in the realised over the estimated value is, or ought to be, the result of more or less accidental circumstances, its abnormal proportions afford little or no ground for anticipating a similar result in the coming year.

RESULTS OF PAST YEAR.

My first duty to-day is to explain how it is that a balance so largely beyond my expectations has been obtained. On the one hand, the Exchequer receipts were more than I expected by £2,059,000. On the other hand, the Exchequer issues were less than I expected by £3,006,000. These two items, added to the £334,000 which I allowed as a margin for the year, bring up the total I mentioned a moment ago to £5,399,000. Hon. Members will see from the statement in their hands that the large decrease on the expenditure side was entirely due to savings by the spending departments and mainly in the Army. The actual savings on the estimated expenditure of 1905–6, the year (for which we were not responsible) which had not been anticipated by March 31st, 1906, were £881,000, and the actual savings on the estimated expenditure for 1906–7, which were anticipated by the close of the financial year, and in respect of which no issues were made, were £1,150,000, making together for the Army a total of £2,031,000. On the revenue side the increase is due almost entirely to three items, in no one of which could its extent have been reasonably foreseen. The first of these comes under Customs; the coal duty, which during the last seven months of its life, April to November, produced £1,495,000, or £345,000 above the estimate, which was based on the highest yield of previous years. That was due to a time of very exceptional activity in the coal export trade, which was stimulated to some extent by strikes and by a shortage of supply in the French and German markets. The second item is the estate duties, which, in consequence of the falling in of a number of abnormally large estates, produced a record yield of nearly £1,200,000 in excess of the estimate. The third item, coming under the heading of "Miscellaneous," is the Mint, the exceptional profits of which are responsible for nearly the whole of the large increase of £441,000 under that head. This is such an unusual circumstance that I ought to say a word about it. The amount payable into the Exchequer under this head consists of the profits on the coinage of silver and bronze token coins, less the sum required to defray the working expenses of the Mint. For some years past the Exchequer receipts from this source have been steadily declining. In 1901–2 they were as much as £595,000. In 1903–4 they had sunk to £174,000, in 1904–5, to £44,000, and in 1905–6 they were as low as £26,000. The main cause of that heavy and progressive decline was that during the period of the South African War there had been a very active demand for coinage, which caused the supplies to become redundant in slacker years. Hense for the past two years there had been comparatively little coinage of new silver, as it was possible to meet the demands merely by the recoinage of worn silver when withdrawn, and these recoinages, of course, yield the Mint no profit, but rather a loss, as the coins have to be made up to standard weight before they are reissued. A year ago it was obvious that the turning point of the depression had been reached, and accordingly, in my Budget of last year, the Mint raised their estimate of receipts to £150,000. The result has far exceeded anticipations. The receipts have actually been £535,000. I am informed that the increase results from a revived demand all round, of which, no doubt, the activity in trade is the chief cause; but it is partly due to the exceptional Colonial demand, the Colonies which have been chiefly responsible for the increase being West Africa and Australasia. Another special contributory cause was the general election, to provide for the various requirements of which half a million of silver was taken. In view of these considerations, it was thought prudent to reduce the estimate to £201,000 for next year. So far, I have been dealing with exceptional and unforeseen causes of increase.

REVENUE RETURNS.

I now turn to the Revenue returns, as a whole. I cannot say they anywhere exhibit very great elasticity. In some respects, in view of the undoubted prosperity of trade, they are distinctly disappointing. As regards dutiable articles of consumption, tea and sugar have in each case very slightly exceeded the Budget estimate. For sugar there has been throughout the year a quiet and steady market, with an even level of prices, on the whole favourable to the consumer. The reduction of the tea duty by one penny was followed by an increase in the consumption of 4,500,000lbs. The year in tea has been a record one as regards imports, exports, and consumption. The great increase throughout the world in the demand, particularly for Indian teas, has raised the price, but there is little reason to doubt that but for the reduction of duty there would have been a still higher rise. Tobacco has not quite realised my expectations. Now I would say one word on what is really a more interesting item to the majority of the members of the Committee—the alcoholic group, in which there has been since 1899, as I pointed out last year, a progressive and formidable decline. Speaking strictly for the moment from the point of view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I am glad to observe that there are at last signs of a slight, but definite, reaction. The Excise receipts on beer and domestic spirits have exceeded the estimate by £150,000; the Customs receipts on wine by £60,000; and on foreign spirits by no less than £435,000. As compared with the actual receipts of 1905-6, the progress of the whole group shows in 1906-7 an increase of £494,000. The income-tax brought in a little more than the estimate. Our other two sources of revenue in addition to those with which I have dealt—namely, stamps and the Post Office—have fallen short of my expectations. The decrease in stamps of £200,000 is entirely attributable to the Stock Exchange and the shrinking in value of the securities which are there marketed. The receipts from deeds, bills of exchange, and companies' capital duty all show a very satisfactory increase. The check which has occurred to the normal growth of the Post Office revenue is more difficult to explain. The year 1905-6 was a year of unbounded prosperity for the Post Office; the receipts exceeded those of the previous year by over a million and were nearly half a million higher than the estimate which had been formed of them. In the four years preceding 1905-6 the average annual increase of the Post Office revenue was £670,000. For the year 1906-7 the estimated increase after allowing for the concessions promised in the Budget was £735,000; the increase actually realized was only £415,000. The causes to which the Post Office authorities attributed this comparative failure—for it is only comparative, not real—were, first, the less expansion in the demand for picture postcards, which have recently been a growing source of revenue, and secondly, the effect of the telephone in supplanting communication through the post. A great many people, particularly within the limits of the same town or district, who used to communicate by post, now speak through the telephone, and the revenue to that extent suffers. The third cause to which this comparative failure is attributed is the less rapid growth of revenue from telephone trunk lines. I ought to add the non-recurrence of a general election, as the general election largely stimulated postal revenue.

If hon. Gentlemen will now turn to the table showing the comparative revenue raised by the State for the year 1906–7 and the previous year they will realise that the revenue with respect to the Exchequer is not the only revenue for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is responsible. He has also to make payments to the Local Taxation Account, which amounted in all for the year 1906-07 to £10,222,000. Of this there was derived from the surtax on beer and spirits £1,416,000; Excise licences, £4,122,000; and estate duties, £4,684,000. If you add this money to the Exchequer account of £144,814,000, it makes a total of £155,036,000. If for the moment we confine our attention to the revenue raised from taxes, adding the local taxation revenue to that which goes to the Exchequer, we shall see that instead of being, as would appear from the Table No. 2, only £119,830,000, the revenue receipts from taxes would be £130,052,000. I had also to provide during the year for capital expenditure amounting to £5,975,000, for which we borrowed £5,555,000, the difference being made up out of balances. The total amount which had to be provided in the year was thus £160,591,000.

Another table (to complete the account for the year) shows the Exchequer balance-sheet. We began the year with an Exchequer balance of £10,451,000, and ended with a balance of £6,932,000. I ought to explain how the difference was made up. The balance was strengthened by a surplus revenue this year of £5,399,000. It was depleted by the issue of the old sinking fund of the previous year to the amount of £3,466,000; by a capital expenditure which was issued in excess of what was borrowed in the year amounting to £420,000; by some small sums £32,000; and then by the rather important item of Treasury bills, temporarily paid off under the Act of last year, amounting to £5,000,000. We took power in the Act of last year to do what previously we could not have done—namely, in the first quarter of the year, when our balance is large, not to renew the Treasury bills we otherwise should have renewed. We were previously in the ridiculous situation of going into the market to borrow money in connection with Treasury bills when the balance at the Exchequer was more than sufficient to meet our requirements. Therefore, we took power last year temporarily to drop those bills, and there has been a considerable saving in interest. For the moment the Exchequer balances are reduced to that extent. That is all I need say in reference to the finance of last year.

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE OF CURRENT YEAR.

Now I come to the current year. First I will deal with the estimated expenditure. An addition of £500,000 to the new Sinking Fund was peculiar to last year, and is not included in the expenditure which the present Budget has to provide. The figures are familiar to hon. Members. I will not go through them except to note that the estimated balance out of revenue assigned to local taxation is £10,045,000. The figures exhibit total reductions over the estimated expenditure of the previous year of £1,664,000. I hope that reduction will be continuous and progessive. It is, in fact, considerably greater than it appears to be, because we have borne on the Army and Navy Votes for the current year sums amounting to £1,019,000, which under the pre-existing system would have been borrowed and charged to capital account. The real reduction, therefore, on the expenditure is £2,683,000. The main item of increase is in the Civil Services, and it is attributable to a large extent to the automatic growth in the cost of elementary education. As I have mentioned, £10,045,000 is assigned out of revenue to local taxation. The estimated capital expenditure for the year is £3,850,000. The total provision for the year is thus on all these accounts £154,652,000.

ESTIMATED REVENUE.

Now I come to the estimated revenue of the country. In regard to that, it is to be remembered that next year is leap year, will have one less Sunday than the past year, and contains no Eastertide. That makes a serious difference to the Exchequer, because it means a gain of two working days. On the other hand, we have lost the coal duty which we had for seven months during the past year, and we have lost the extra penny of the tea duty which was in force for the first six weeks of the last financial year. Perhaps it will be convenient if I give the figures and then make such comments as I have to make. Customs, £31,740,000, showing a diminution, owing to the causes I have mentioned, of £1,190,000; excise, £30,600,000, an increase of £250,000; estate duties, £13,600,000, a diminution (because we cannot reckon on a continuance of this abnormal mortality among the very rich) of £800,000; stamps, £8,000,000, a small increase of £50,000; land tax, £700,000, house duty, £1,900,000, a decrease in the former, and an increase in the other which practically balance one another; and then the important item of property and income-tax, £32,500,000, or an increase of £900,000 on the amount received last year. That gives a total estimated tax revenue of £119,040,000, or a diminution as compared with the tax revenue of last year of £790,000. Then I come to the non tax revenue—Post Office, £17,600,000, an increase of £430,000; telegraphs, £4,400,000, an increase of £145,000; Crown lands, £500,000, a diminution of £20,000; receipts from Suez Canal shares, £1,100,000, an increase of £2,000; and miscellaneous, £1,550,000, a decrease of £391,000, which I have already explained in dealing with the Mint. The total non-tax revenue is estimated to be £25,150,000, or an increase of £166,000 as compared with the preceding year. Adding these figures together, you get a total Exchequer revenue of £144,190,000, or a diminution as compared with the preceding year of £624,000.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.

The estimates of Customs and Excise have been framed after making what seems a safe allowance for the increased spending power of the consuming classes. There is an exceptionally large increase in the income-tax, no less than £900,000, partly due to the early date of Easter having delayed the collection this year and thrown an unusual proportion of the receipts for 1906–7 into 1907–8, and it is partly due to the fact that two good years now come into the three years' average on which the income-tax returns are made up. The other items call for little remark except the item "Miscellaneous," which I have already explained, and the estate duties, a most uncertain element, which we have put at £13,600,000, £400,000 in excess of the last Budget Estimate and £800,000 behind the actual receipts. This brings out a total estimated Exchequer revenue for the year of, as I have said, £144,190,000; and if you set that against the estimated expenditure of

£140,757,000, it shows an estimated surplus for the year of £3,433,000. To save further reference to the matter, I must deduct from that a sum of £200,000 which has not appeared on the Estimates, and represents a temporary continuance for another year of the grant in aid made last year to necessitous school areas, which, in consequence of the failure of the Education Bill to pass into law, it is necessary to renew. The available surplus is thus reduced to £3,233,000.

CAPITAL LIABILITIES OF THE STATE.

Before I pass away from the examination of last year, I must explain what we have done during the year in regard to the capital liabilities of the State. I endeavoured in my last year's Budget speech to make clear the distinction between what is popularly called the National Debt, the dead weight debt of the country, and the other capital liabilities which have been for the most part created during the last fifteen years for special purposes against specific assets, actual or potential, and each with a Sinking Fund of its own. I will deal with the two things separately. I take first the dead weight debt—the National Debt, popularly so-called, which consists of three items—the Funded Debt, the estimated capital liabilities in regard to terminable annuities, and the Unfunded or floating Debt. I will compare each of these items as they stood respectively on 1st April, 1906, and 31st March, 1907. The Funded Debt on 1st April, 1906, was £634,048,000, and on 31st March it was £631,929,000, a reduction of £2,119,000. The estimated capital liabilities in regard to terminable annuities on 1st April, 1906, were £43,459,000, and on 31st March, 1907, £40,864,000, a reduction of £2,595,000. The Unfunded Debt on 1st April was £65,713,000—and I ought to add a word of caution before I read the next figure—and on 31st March, 1907, £51,713,000, or an apparent reduction of £14,000,000; but the actual reduction was not £14,000,000, but £9,000,000, £5,000,000 being due to the temporary dropping of the Treasury bills, of which I have given an explanation; but after allowance has been made for that, there was an actual realised reduction on the Unfunded Debt during the year of no less than £9,000,000 sterling. The permanent reduction, as the Committee will see, effected during the course of the year 1906–7 in the National Debt was £13,714,000. It is only fair and right to say that in making that large reduction we are indebted to the extent of £3,466,000 to the Old Sinking Fund left by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Worcestershire, East.

Mr. Asquith.

WAR DEBT.

I think it will be convenient to the Committee to point out to what extent this reduction has affected the additional debt caused by the war. The debt contracted during the war was as follows:—Treasury bills, £13,000,000; Exchequer bonds, amounting in all to £24,000,000; the War Loan stock, which falls due in 1910, £30,000,000; and the new issue of Consols, £92,000,000. So that the total addition made to the debt of the country in consequence of the war was £159,000,000. Now, Sir, it will be interesting to the Committee to see how far that additional debt has been reduced. It now stands at £138,827,000. In other words the war debt has been reduced, almost entirely in the last two years, by £20,173,000, and of that amount the reduction effected in the last financial year 1906–7 was £9,643,000. That is to say, what I have said shows that during the past year the war debt has been reduced by £9,643,000, and the total deadweight debt by £13,714,000. That does not complete the matter, because we have also the other capital liabilities of the State to take into account. In regard to those other liabilities, I anticipated that we might have to raise during the year £6,500,000, which, after allowing for the Sinking Fund charged upon the Votes, would mean a total net addition of £4,600,000. The total amount issued has been £5,975,000, of which £420,000 is provided out of balances, and the amount borrowed therefore was reduced to £5,555,000, and as the various Sinking Funds that came into operation during the year amounted to £1,666,000, the net addition to the debt was £3,889,000. Some of these items, I am glad to say, will never reappear, one in particular—the Cunard agreement, under which we had to issue last year £1,684,000. If the addition under that head is subtracted from the reduction made on the National Debt, it will appear that the gross liabilities of the nation were reduced during the year by £9,825,000.

REDUCTION OF DEBT.

Now I turn to the current year. In the current year the fixed provision for reducing the Debt automatically is £28,000,000, being £500,000 less than last year. We have made during last year the last two payments on account of Chancery funds annuity, amounting to £1,162,000 in all. The result is that, out of the fixed Debt charge there will be applicable to the reduction of Debt during the year £9,383,000, in addition to the realised surplus of last year, £5,399,000. The two together make up £14,782,000; and, if I add miscellaneous receipts to the reduction of Debt—including the China indemnity of £318,000—estimated to amount in all to £600,000, the total sum available should be not less than £15,382,000. The issues on account of capital liabilities, happily, as I have said, growing less year by year, are estimated as likely to be £3,850,000, of which £2,855,000 is authorised by existing Acts, and the balance under the Telegraph Bill to be introduced this Session. On the other hand, there is provided, on the Votes for the repayment of principal of this class of liabilities, a sum of £2,030,000; so that the maximum addition for the year cannot exceed £1,970,000. Therefore, the estimated sum available during the current year for the diminution of the gross liabilities of the State is £13,400,000. Sir, if I may take the two years together, I should like the Committee to keep the figures in their mind. First of all, I will take the deadweight Debt. If you take the actual reduction in 1906–7 and the sums which are applicable or will be applicable to the reduction of the Debt in 1907–8, they make a total for the two years of £29,096,000. On the other hand, if you take the gross liabilities of the nation, the actual reduction in 1906–7 and the sum which is applicable or will be applicable to reduction in 1907-8, make a total reduction on the whole of the capital liabilities of the nation for the two years of no less than £23,225,000.

FINANCIAL POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Now, Sir, I have finished, I am glad to say, that somewhat dry, but necessary, recital. Before I come to what I am sure will be to the Committee a much more interesting theme — namely, the intention of the Government as to the disposal of the available surplus, I think it right, on behalf of the Government, to make a more general statement than is usual on these occasions of the lines on which, in our opinion, the finance of the country during the next few years should be directed. It is, I think, a mistake to treat the annual Budget as if it were a thing by itself, and not, as it is, or as it certainly ought to be, an integral part and a necessary link in a connected and coherent chain of policy. In my opinion, and I think it is an opinion that will be shared by a great number of hon. Gentlemen opposite, the country has reached a stage in which, whether we look merely at its fiscal or at its social exigencies, we cannot afford to drift along the stream and treat each year's finance as if it were self-contained. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in other words, ought to Budget, not for one year, but for several years. It is in that spirit that the proposals which I am going presently to submit to the Committee have been conceived, and it is from that point of view that I ask they shall be judged.

STATE OF NATIONAL CREDIT.

What, then, are the lines for financial progress which this Government, and a majority in this House, are bound by their pledges and by their convictions to pursue? First and foremost, we are under an immediate obligation, often insisted upon when we sat upon the other side in the last Parliament, and reiterated certainly by me over and over again at the general election after I had assumed the office of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—an immediate obligation of reinstating and improving the national credit. I am bound to say that there is no subject upon which more exaggerated and sometimes more nonsensical language has been used. Consols, like all other so-called gilt-edged securities, have been at a low level of price during the last six months. They once nearly touched eighty-four. Immediately we had an outcry. Some of the more irresponsible among the mischiefmongers of the Press declared that the credit of this country was gone—gone because we had a Liberal Government in power dragged by a Socialist tail. Even a grave and seasoned economist like the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield began to show signs of perturbation. People forforget the simple and surely indisputable arithmetical fact that a 2½ per cent. Stock at 83, which we have not yet touched, is equivalent to a 3 per cent. stock at 100. They forget further, or perhaps they have never learned the equally indisputable historical fact that our 3 per cent. Consols, the admitted premier security of the world, during the whole course of their long history never remained at or above 100 for a whole year. It is quite true that during the intermediate period after conversion, when Consols were a 2¾ per cent. stock, they rose for some years to a high premium, even as high as 114. How was that? That was at a time when, owing, among other causes, to the relative slackness of trade and to the rapid development of the new source of gold supply in South Africa, the value of money ruled very low, and a secure 2¾ per cent. stock was, what it is not to-day, a very tempting investment. That was a state of things that could not have lasted long, even if the war had not occurred. But there has been a serious fall, and one which has affected all the better class of securities. I think I ought to take this opportunity of giving what I conceive to be the explanation. It is not far to seek, and it has nothing whatever to do, I venture to submit, with the misdoings, actual or imagined, of His Majesty's present advisers. We have seen in recent years enormous additions, due not only to the war, but also to other causes, to the liabilities both of the State and of the municipalities; the admission of colonial stocks to the extent of something like £300,000,000 sterling to the category of trust investments; abnormal activity leading to higher wages and higher prices in almost every form of business both at home and abroad; catastrophes in North and South America which have brought about a considerable destruction of insured property, much of which had to be replaced by the realisation of gilt-edged securities; and gigantic speculations in shares and the issue of new obligations which have been going on upon the other side of the Atlantic. Take all these causes into account, following as they have done an exceptional drain upon the whole fabrics of currency and of credit, and operating as they were bound to do with converging force here in London, which is the only free and open market for gold, and you have more than sufficient reason to account for the low level of price in the best class of security. These patriotic gentlemen to whom I referred a few moments ago might, I think, find some better occupation both for their tongues and their pens than trying to disparage and belittle the credit of their country, which still, when all is said and done, remains better and higher than that of any other country in the world. But the fact remains that the existing condition of things, which is largely the result, as I have said, of the unliquidated commitments of recent years, is for the time being a source of embarrassment, not to the Government alone. Happily, there is no question of the Government's, as a Government, having to go into the market to add to the debt for which we are directly liable. Take, however, the case of Irish land security, which is guaranteed by the British Government. Fresh issues of that stock must from time to time be made to keep the operation of purchase going, and the whole loss upon the flotation of that stock which must arise in the present state of the market falls upon the Irish Development Grant, which, if my memory is right, was originally intended to serve the purpose of Irish education. It is a mistake to suppose that this is a matter which only affects the City, what is called the "high finance." It affects every community and every class in the country. Look at the position of our great municipalities. From the London County Council downwards they can raise capital only upon terms which, as compared with those of ten years ago, are grievously burdensome to the ratepayers, with the result that in every direction their activity is being crippled. You may think, if you like, that some forms of their activity are misguided, but there are some, at any rate, innocuous, and others absolutely essential to the well-being of the community. What is true of them is true, in varying degrees of inconvenience and of severity, of almost every trading concern in the country. Taking these facts into view, I have no hesitation in drawing the conclusion that a substantial and exceptional effort to effect a further reduction in the Debt is, for the moment, one of the paramount duties of the Government.

SOCIAL REFORM.

But behind and beyond this there lies the whole still unconquered territory of social reform. Social reform may be regarded, according to the point of view from which you look at it, as a luxury or as a necessity, but in any case it is expensive. It has to be paid for. Someone must be prepared to meet the bill. Well, now, this is a House of Commons which was elected more clearly and definitely than any other House in our history in the hope and belief on the part of the electors that it would find the road and provide the means for social reform. No doubt social reform is a phrase vague in itself, which carries different meanings to different minds. But there are some things which it certainly means to all of us who sit upon this side of the House, and I fancy to a good many who sit opposite. I myself, for instance—if I may refer to myself—am not what is called a Socialist. I believe in the right of every man face to face with the State to make the best of himself, and, subject to the limitation that he does not become a nuisance or a danger to the community, to make less than the best of himself. This world is much too full of wrong-doing, and of injustice, and of unmerited suffering; but, in my judgment, the way of escape is not to be found in any solution, or so-called solution, which, by slowly but surely drying up the reservoir which gives vitality to human personality and human purpose, will in the long run leave the universe a more sterile place. I say this in no polemical spirit, not at all, but simply by way of emphasising the fact that to all of us—people like myself who may be regarded by some of my hon. friends below the gangway as a lukewarm Moderate—there is nothing that calls so loudly or so imperiously as the possibilities of social reform. Just let me, in order to make plain what I am going to say, invite the House to look at two sets of figures in our modern community, whose appeal is irresistible.

THE STATE AND THE CHILD.

First of all there is the child, for whom heredity and parental care have perhaps done nothing or worse than nothing. And yet it is the raw material, upon the fashioning of which depends whether it shall add to the common stock of wealth and intelligence and goodness, or whether it shall be cast aside as a waste product in the social rubbish heap. The State has long recognised that it cannot pass by that appeal with folded arms. It has put the child to school, it keeps the child at school, and (much as it shocks some excellent people) after the legislation of last year, if the poor body of the child is benumbed with cold or pinched with hunger so that it can get no benefit from its lessons, it will even go so far as to help to provide it with bread Does the House realise what the recognition of that means on the part of the State, what every one of us now agrees is a duty, though it was neglected and passed by generation after generation by humane and far-sighted statesmen? Does anyone realise what the performance of that duty has cost this community? Let me give two or three figures which I think very striking. In the year 1869–70, the last year of what I may call the old system, the total cost of education to the public in the form of Parliamentary grants—for of course there was no rate-aid at that time—was £721,000. What was it in the year 1906–7? Your Parliamentary grants, if you add the Exchequer contributions, as you ought to, were £13,359,000; sums raised by local rates were £11,785,000; a total of £25,144,000. That is what it has cost the State to recognise its duty to the children of the community. I do not say that every penny or every pound of that money is well or wisely spent. I rejoice to think that we have at the head of the Board of Education my right hon. friend the President, a severe economist, who subjects the whole of this expenditure to a most searching review. But this I do say, that there is not a man who sits on either side of the House who is prepared substantially to recede from the performance of this enormous duty. Well, that is one thing.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

There is another thing, nearer the other end of the journey of life, which makes an equally strong, though hitherto an unavailing, appeal both to the interest and to the conscience of society —I mean the figure of the man or woman who, perhaps, spent out with a life of ill-requited labour, find themselves confronted in old age, without fault or demerit of their own, with the prospect of physical want and the sacrifice of self-respect. Sir, I never gave, nor, so far as I know, did any of my colleagues on this Bench give, any pledge at the elections on the subject of what is called old-age pensions. We knew something of the magnitude of the problem, and we thought it wrong to raise expectations without the knowledge that they could be met. Nor do I now commit myself or any of my colleagues to any specific scheme, although both my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and myself have laid down certain conditions to which, in our judgment, any practical proposal must conform. Whatever is done in this matter, as I have said before in this House, must be done by steps and stages, and cannot be achieved at a single blow. But this I do say, and I wish to say it with all the emphasis of which I am capable, speaking for the whole of my colleagues who sit upon this Bench, that in the sphere of finance we regard this as the most serious and the most urgent of all the demands for social reform; and that it is our hope—I will go further and say it is our intention, before the close of this Parliament—yes, before the close of the next session of this Parliament, if we are allowed to have our way—it is a large "if"—to lay firm the foundations of this reform.

FREE TRADE.

To that general statement there is one thing that I want to add, though perhaps the addition is hardly necessary. We are a free-trade Government. This is a free-trade House of Commons. Whatever new resources we can provide for any purpose I have indicated are subject to that governing condition. In a sense, of course, that involves a limitation of the area. [OPPOSITION Cries of "Hear, hear."] I thought that sentence would be appreciated. But it is a limitation of the area only in the sense in which a wise builder, who is seeking to lay the foundations of an enduring structure, recognises the limits which divide firm ground from an unfathomable morass. We do not dogmatise about free trade. We are neither professors nor missionaries. There is nothing we need say to countries which adopt other systems than our own. But for us here, 43,000,000 of people in these two small islands, dependent as we are upon extraneous sources of supply for the food of the people and the materials of the industry, the one free, open, untrammelled market in the whole world—for us, I say, free trade is the breath of life, and there is no social reform that would not be dearly purchased by its sacrifice. Well, I think we do not always sufficiently recognise the immense advantage which we had in the recent controversy from the fact that protection presented itself to the electors of this country in its most questionable and vulnerable shape. It was entangled from the first, and it was ultimately strangled, by being bound up with the taxation of corn and meat, the first necessaries of life; and, as we showed, must have the inevitable consequence, if the proposed scheme were to be fairly applied as between different parts of the Empire, of taxing the raw materials of our different industries. [OPPOSITION cries of "Why?"] I have argued the question on a hundred platforms, and I am not going to do so again. I am only expressing my opinion that it was that which killed protection, and it is that which will kill it again. But, Sir, I can conceive the protectionist invitation being couched in much more insidious and much more alluring accents. I think, therefore, that it is wise for us who are, as I have said, not only the party of social reform, but the party also of free trade, to make it clear if we can—and I believe we can make it clear—that the attainment of the one is not incompatible with the maintenance of the other.

TAXATION AND SOCIAL REFORM.

That may seem to be a digression, but it really has, as the Committee will see, a very direct bearing upon the concrete proposals I am now going to make. I repeat if we are to have social reform we must be ready to pay for it, and when I say "we" I mean the whole nation—the working and consuming classes as well as the wealthier class of direct taxpayers. An important practical inference at once arises. If these two objects, the strengthening of our national credit and the provision for social reform, are to be the governing aims of our policy, large as my estimated surplus may seem to be, I cannot deal with it in such a way as to involve any permanent diminution of revenue of a substantial character.

That puts at once on one side more than one suggestion which, in other circumstances I might yield to, for the remission or repeal of particular taxation. For instance, I have been urged, in the course of the year to repeal almost every tax, but I have been urged with particular insistence to deal with what are called the war taxes. What are the war taxes? They cover a pretty wide area of ground. They include 4d. on the income-tax, the whole of the sugar duties, one penny still of the tea tax, and all the extra imposts on tobacco, beer, and spirits, amounting, I suppose altogether, to something like £20,000,000 sterling. From this point of view, although they are all war taxes, each of them is equally entitled to consideration. What is a war tax? A war tax is not a tax put on to last during a war and to come to an end the moment peace is concluded and your Army is withdrawn from the field. It is a tax which is put on to meet the extra burden imposed on the country by waging war; and so long as that extra burden remains—and it remains, as I have shown to the Committee, to the tune of something like £130,000,000 of extra debt—the claim that the war tax *qua* war tax can be removed is, in my opinion, an inadmissible claim. I will just say two or three words about one or two particular duties with regard to which special appeals have been made.

COCOA DUTY.

First of all, there is a little duty, a very small one, to which I observe my predecessor in office is beginning to pay a good deal of attention—the cocoa duty.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): I have not asked you to take it off.

*MR. ASQUITH: The cocoa duty produces, I think, about £250,000. It is a very small and not very productive tax. I think, if you ask me the question, as the right hon. Gentleman did, by implication, this afternoon, that there is a good deal of the flavour of protection about the present scale of cocoa duty. I should not defend it myself from the point of view of a free-trader, and I do not think it is defensible; but it is a very small affair, and you must notice this about it, that this duty, with its protectionist flavour, has stood the scrutiny, and has been preserved, at any rate, with the connivance of Mr. Gladstone, of Sir William Harcourt, of Sir Stafford Northcote, of Mr. Goschen, and of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who slightly increased its protective character—a string, I should think, of as good and severe free-traders as have ever been responsible for the finances of this country. I might say that what was good enough for them is good enough for me. At any rate, I think that, with that history behind the cocoa duty, I may safely postpone, as I propose to do, the expurgation of this very small protectionist taint, which, I admit, still lurks in this particular part of our fiscal system. So much for the cocoa duty.

TEA AND SUGAR DUTIES.

Then there is the case of tea and sugar. The tea duty was reduced last year by a 1d. It now stands at 5d., that is to say only a 1d. above the lowest point it reached before the time of the war, and I am satisfied, from a careful review of the existing conditions of the trade, that any further attempt at this moment to deal with the duty, in the way of reduction of another 1d., would not be of any real profit to the consumers of tea. The sugar duty is one of a very peculiar character. It bring in over £6,000,000, which is, to my mind, almost as strong an argument as you could possible use for not lightly interfering with it. Objectionable as I think it is, and have always thought it, as a tax both on the food of the poor and upon the raw material of several important industries, it is a duty with which you cannot deal piecemeal. It is a duty which, translated into terms of retail prices, works out at something like ½d. on the ordinary pound of sugar, and, as we do not deal in this country in retail trade with farthings, I say, if you were to halve the sugar duty I do not think you would do any good whatever to the great bulk of consumers in the country. You might do good to some of the trades, like the confectionery and the mineral water trades, in which sugar is a raw material, but I do not believe you would benefit the working classes or the consuming part of the community unless you get rid of the duty altogether. That is out of the question, and I dismiss it from consideration. I say, generally, having regard to the principle which I have laid down, the practical conclusion to which I have come is that I must not permanently impair my sources of revenue in view of the future, and I do not propose this year to make any change in the indirect taxation of the country.

PROPOSED CHANGES—IMPERIAL EXCHEQUER AND LOCAL TAXATION.

I now come to the changes which I am in fact going to propose. First of all, I will deal with a matter which, though it does not immediately affect, for good or evil, the revenue of this particular year, is, in my judgment, of the greatest importance with regard to the future. I refer to the relations between the Imperial Exchequer and local taxation. I propose, as from the end of the present financial year—I cannot break up the year for this purpose—but, as from the 1st of April next, to sweep away, root and branch, the whole system by which assigned revenue, the proceeds of Imperial taxes, is intercepted from the Exchequer and handed over to local authorities. The arrangements which I ask Parliament to terminate were initiated nearly twenty years ago, in 1888, by the late Lord Goschen, whom we have lost since I last presented a Budget to this House. He was a great financier, a great administrator, a man who brought a rare combination of clear insight, cultured intelligence, subtle reasoning power, wide expert knowledge, and indomitable and inflexible courage, to the service of the State. Lord Goschen introduced this system, and his scheme, as conceived by him and as presented to this House in 1888, had, no doubt, a good deal to recomend it. He had a twofold object in view—first, to provide a contribution from personalty towards local expenditure, and next, to effect a permanent settlement between local and Imperial taxation by handing over to local authorities certain duties or taxes. Amongst these were the licensing duties, which it was intended should be collected locally, a power at the same time being given to the local authorities to vary them by raising or lowering them, a moiety of the probate duty on personal property, and certain proposed new taxes—the van and wheel tax, which never saw the light of day, together with the surtaxes on beer and spirits, which were assigned with the special object of providing funds for compensation for the extinction of licences. That was the scheme, but as all of us who were here at the time, and as all know as a matter of history, in the course of its passage through this House it was mutilated beyond all recognition. The van and wheel tax was abandoned. The local authorities got the licensing duties, it is true, but without the power of raising them, and without the power of collecting them. They were really Imperial taxes, collected by Imperial officers, which, by a thoroughly illogical and indefensible process, never came to the Imperial Exchequer, but were intercepted on the way, and reached the hands of the local authorities, who had nothing to do with them but to spend them. As regards the death duties, with the revision of those duties in 1894 by Sir William Harcourt even the semblance of a special contribution from personalty to local taxation disappeared; and the Agricultural Rates Act and various other Acts which have since been passed have rendered the system even more intolerable than it was before.

Mr. Asquith.

The Committee may not find it interesting, but I think it is necessary to show what the present condition of things is. First of all, there is the estate duty. Part of it, representing the old probate duty, goes, under the Act of 1894, to the Local Taxation Account, and is divided between the three kingdoms in certain fixed proportions, though it is a variable amount. And it is further complicated by this, that, owing to the passing of the Tithe Rent-Charge Act, from the English portion of that varying amount another varying amount is every year deducted for the purpose of the tithe rent-charge grant. Then a further part of the estate duty goes to agricultural rates. In England, that contribution is made entirely out of the estate duty. In Scotland it is made mainly out of the estate duty, with, also, a grant from the Consolidated Fund; and in Ireland it is wholly made out of the Consolidated Fund. Take the case of licences. In England and Scotland the proceeds of the local taxation licences are given to the various authorities according to the amount collected in their several areas. Ireland gets three so-called equivalents. I am not sure, though I do not want to raise any question of controversy with hon. Gentlemen whom I see sitting opposite to me, that they are not a good deal more than equivalents. But, at all events, they receive three so-called equivalents for these licence duties out of the Consolidated Fund. And, finally, you have the beer and spirits duty, which is divided between the three kingdoms in the fixed proportion. Could a more head-splitting condition of chaos and confusion possibly be presented to the House of Commons? I think that everybody concerned either with local or Imperial taxation will agree that it is time that the system was put an end to. It will stop an enormous amount of complication and difficulty in our national accounts; and, from the point of view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which is the point of view from which I mainly regard it at the moment, it will set his hands free, as they are not free at present, to deal with some of the most important sources of taxation. I have been pressed very much to alter and raise the duty on motor-cars. I should be very much disposed to do so. I think a tax on motor-cars is almost an ideal tax, because it is a tax on a luxury which is apt to degenerate into a nuisance. But it is no good, so long as this system prevails, for me or for anyone else to put an additional duty on motor-cars; for where does the duty go to? It goes to the local authority by whom these duties are collected, that is to say, as a rule, the local authority within whose area the person resides to whom the motor-car belongs. Suppose I pay, under a new addition to the motor duty, as I should pay, here in London, an extra duty on my motor-car, the benefit goes entirely to the London County Council. But it is not the streets and roads of London to which my motor-car does injury, it is to the rural districts of England and Scotland. Nothing can be more illogical or unjust than that distribution of the matter. Let me take another case, much more important—take the duty on the licences of public-houses. I wish to have my hands set free in that matter also. At present the proceeds of those duties go to the Local Taxation Account, and there, again, they go to the local authorities in proportion to the number of licences which are taken out in their respective areas. You could not possibly have a system better calculated to put a premium on a lethargic and non-public-spirited licensing authority. To set free the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for these and other purposes it is eminently desirable that he should recover complete control over the whole of this class of duties. I do not want the local authorities to suffer; as far as my plan is concerned, they will not suffer and will not be one halfpenny out of pocket. I propose that in future, after the close of the present financial year, they should no longer have any concern with probate duty, local taxation licences, or beer and spirits, but that they should receive from the Consolidated Fund a sum equivalent to the proceeds of these respective sources of revenue that at present go to the Local Taxation Account, and at the present rates of charge. I mean, of course, that, if in the future you raise the duties of any of this class of licences, that is not to be taken into account in the sum which the local authorities are to receive.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: They would share in any natural growth?

*MR. ASQUITH: They would share in any natural growth—that is to say, they would receive precisely the same sum in any year as they would receive now if the present state of things was continued; a natural growth or a natural diminution, as the case may be. The object is, as I say, first of all to get rid of an enormous, most unsightly and inconvenient complication in our national accounts; secondly, to set free the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to a large area of taxation; and thirdly, to clear the ground—for this is only a provisional arrangement—for a future re-settlement, I hope on equitable terms, of the whole relations between the central authority and the local authorities. That is the first of the proposals that I make to the House, and I hope it may be received as of almost a non-controversial character.

INCOME-TAX.

Now I come to more thorny ground. I have said that I do not propose in any way to alter indirect taxation; but I do propose to deal with the income-tax. The income-tax, as it is one of the most productive, so it is one of the most delicate parts of our fiscal machinery. There is nothing like it to be found anywhere else in the world. It produced this year something like £32,000,000 to the Exchequer, and the largest part of that sum, no less than two-thirds of the whole, through the operation of our system of deduction at the source, is collected, without difficulty or friction, without any necessity for the taxpayer to draw a cheque or even open his purse, and almost without his being made conscious that he is being taxed at all—I said almost. As regards the remainder, one-third of the whole, the process of ascertaining and getting in what is due with ease and expedition depends upon a certain amount, at any rate, of co-operation—it is not expected to be very cordial—between the taxing authority and the person assessed, and still more upon the harmonious interaction of the central and localised parts of the machine. Now there is nothing in the world easier, I know it because I have tried the experiment, than to sit down at a table and draw up on a piece of paper an ideally perfect scheme of income-tax, logically graduated from the top to the bottom, safeguarded by an elaborate machinery of inquisition, and detection, and punishment, all administered by the pitiless and impartial hands of a perfectly dispassionate central authority. Nothing is so easy on paper; but when you are brought into contact, as I am almost daily, with the actual administrative problem, you find you have to content yourself with something very much less ambitious. And if the reform I am about to propose falls short, as I am afraid it will, of some people's expectation, it is governed and limited by severely practical considerations. The income-tax is really a twofold tax, it is a tax on property and a tax on earnings. I start with this proposition, and a most important proposition it is, that it must now be regarded as an integral and permanent part of our financial system. If that proposition is once enunciated and admitted, it makes it impossible to justify, if there be any practical way of escape, the present incidence of the income-tax. After you have reached the limit of abatement, which is now £700, the State taxes all incomes at the same rate, whatever may be their character or source. Just compare two cases. You have here A, a man who derives, we will say, a thousand a year from a perfectly safe investment in the funds, perhaps accumulated and left to him by his father; on the other hand you have B, a man making the same nominal sum by personal labour in the pursuit of some arduous and perhaps precarious profession or some form of business. The one is under no necessity to make provision either for his children or for old age; the income will go on being automatically received as long as the investment remains; the other, if a man of ordinary prudence, is bound, his work being carried on subject to risks to health and all the other vicissitudes of fortune, year by year to deduct from his nominal income and set aside a sufficient sum to make provision for contingencies in the future. To say that those two people are, from the point of view of the State, to be taxed in the same way is, to my mind, flying in the face of justice and common sense. That is the feature of the tax which has never been justified by any of the great men, Mr. Pitt, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Gladstone, and the others who have been concerned in its introduction and development; it has always been palliated on the ground either that the income tax was a mere temporary expedient, or that it was impossible to make the distinction without destroying its productiveness, which is the same thing as saying that it ought not to be more than a temporary expedient. For a tax whose effective continuance involves the annual perpetration of a gross injustice is a tax which ought to be reserved, at any rate, for great and pressing emergencies.

HISTORY OF INCOME-TAX.

If I am not wearying the Committee, as this is very important, let me very briefly review the history of the tax. The income-tax was introduced by Mr. Pitt in 1798, in almost the darkest hour in our great struggle with France. It was avowedly a temporary tax put on for the purposes of war. Our ancestors, when they did these things, did not do them by halves, and the tax was 2s. in the £. Incomes of £60 and under were exempt, and up to £200 there was a differential rate proceeding by steps. That tax was reintroduced, after a year of peace, in 1802–1803, by Mr. Addington, at the lower rate of 1s. In 1806, war still continuing, it was raised by Lord Henry Petty, the Whig Chancellor of the Exchequer, to 2s.; and he for the first time introduced a distinction, since dropped, between earned and unearned incomes by providing—and this was the state of things that prevailed from 1806 to 1816—that, as regards abatements, only earned incomes should be entitled to them. In 1816 the tax came to an end, and, although Lord Liverpool's Government attempted to continue it, they were, by a large majority of this House, defeated in their attempt; and I think it was Mr. Brougham who moved that all the records of the tax should be burnt or destroyed, in order that posterity should never know that such a tax had existed. That was the early history of the tax. It was revived in 1842 by Sir Robert Peel, not as a war tax, but again as a temporary expedient, only for a period of three years, to enable him to effect a reconstruction of the tariff. Mr. Gladstone never liked the income-tax; as a member of Sir Robert Peel's Government he opposed its introduction; during the whole of his life he was anxious to see its gradual extinction; and on a celebrated historic occasion he invited the country to agree with him in abolishing it altogether. In his picturesque language, speaking of Sir Robert Peel's revival of the tax in 1842, he spoke of calling forth from its repose this giant, which had once shielded us in war, to come to assist our industrious toils in peace. The industrious toils were assisted to this extent, the tax was imposed by Sir Robert Peel at the comparatively moderate rate of 7d. in the pound; but he raised the limit of total exemption to £150, and above that everybody was taxed exactly alike. Sir Robert Peel defended it mainly on the ground that the tax was a temporary one. It was taken in hand again by Mr. Gladstone in 1853, who proposed that it should continue seven years at a diminishing rate, and extended it to Ireland, not altogether without consideration. ["Oh."] He reduced the limit of exemption to £100, but between £100 and £150 gave abatements at a lower rate of tax. I should like to quote two sentences from Mr. Gladstone's speech on that occasion. In refusing to make any differentiation between earned and unearned incomes, he said—

> "I do not at all deny that the case of the professional man appeals to my sympathy; in my opinion, that is one of the reasons which indicate that the tax ought to be a temporary tax."

And again he said—

> "It is not adapted to be a permanent portion of your fiscal system unless you can by reconstruction remove its anomalies."

I found myself on that opinion. We now recognise the tax to be a permanent part of our system; and following Mr. Gladstone, I think that we must do something to remove the anomaly and to arrive at some scheme, without destroying the essential features or the productive character of the tax, which differentiates incomes, not only as to amount, but also as to the source whence they are derived and the conditions under which they are enjoyed. I need not weary the Committee by giving the history of the different steps by which the present scale of abatement has been reached. We all know that in incomes up to £700 there is a substantial abatement; but it may be interesting to point out that at the present rate of 1s. in the pound an income of £200 pays 2½d.; an income of £300, 5½d.; £400, 7¼d.; £500, 8½d.; £600, 9½d.; and £700, 10¾d., so that the Committee will observe that the principle of differentiation prevails now to that extent. What is the result? The income-tax is not only 1s. in the pound, but of the million of taxpayers, 800,000 to 850,000, or four-fifths of the whole, showing an income of £275,000,000, are under £700. This extension of the scale of abatement has much simplified the question. Mr. Gladstone used to say—

> "Take the poor widow with £300 a year derived from investments, and bringing up a family; is she to be placed in a worse position and to be taxed at a higher rate than the small business or professional man making £300 a year from his business?"

There is great force in the argument, but it should be remembered that nobody pays the whole rate unless his or her income is over £700 a year.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Having been impressed with these general considerations, I last session moved for the appointment of a Select Committee, which sat under the presidency of my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean. This Committee took evidence, and made a valuable Report; and I am sure that the House is very much indebted to the members of the Committee for their labours. They were unanimous, as I gather—and it was a Committee which represented all parts and sections of the House—in upholding the necessity of making a difference between earned and unearned incomes. What is an earned income? It is not easy to draw a distinction, but we can but do our best. First of all, there are the incomes of all officers and *employés* paid by salary. That, I think, includes the clergyman. Although he derives his income and pays income tax under Schedule A from the glebe or tithe rent-charge, his income is really paid to him in consideration of the services rendered by him in the performance of his clerical duties. Secondly, it clearly includes every class of professional man; and, thirdly, all traders whose income is substantially —and I lay stress on the word "substantially"—derived from their own personal labour. In the first two categories no difficulties arise at all. The difficulty arises in the third class—how to take into account the amount of capital a man brings into his business, and to deal with the class of incomes which are either wholly earned or partly earned and partly unearned, means a degree of logical precision where there will be the greatest possible difficulty in hindering overlapping in dubious cases. I am satisfied, however, that a much more practical way of dealing with this branch of the question is to confine the differential treatment to earned incomes which do not exceed £2,000 in amount. The Select Committee suggested £3,000, but I think that £2,000 is quite as far as you can fairly go. I confine the differential treatment, therefore, to persons whose total income from all sources does not exceed £2,000—not merely their earned incomes, but from all sources. In the case of a man who is left £40,000 or £50,000 a year by his father, and by becoming a director of companies earns another £1,000, I think it is absurd to give him a preferential treatment on the score that he is a man with an earned income. I do not think that the principle should be carried to that extent. First of all, therefore, the earned income in respect of which relief is given should not exceed £2,000, and secondly, the whole income from all sources should not exceed £2,000.

METHOD OF DIFFERENTIATION.

How do we carry out the differentiation? I propose that where these conditions are satisfied—the income-tax remaining as a normal tax at the rate of 1s.—the income-tax should be imposed on the earned incomes within these limits at the lower rate of 9d. in the pound, being a relief of 3d. in the pound to this class of income-tax payer. That is to be in addition to, and not in derogation of, all existing exemptions and abatements. The burden of proof will be on the individual claiming the lower rate, and we shall provide that he must make his claim with his return—this is a most important point—if he is a person to whom the formal return is sent and is required to fill it up; if he is not, he must claim exemption and abatement not later than 30th September in the year. In this way we shall avoid the enormous congestion of claims for refunds and abatements which accumulate at the end of every year. It is only fair to say to such a claimant, "If you want to be rated at the lower rate you must be zealous in the matter yourself." I propose to supplement these provisions with another set of provisions which are very much needed, and which carry out in the main the provisions of Lord Ritchie's Committee which sat two or three years ago. That Committee proved that under the present system there is much evasion and leakage. I propose to make it compulsory on every man who receives a form —that well-known buff-coloured form— as one of the annual incidents of the tax to make a declaration and to send back the return, even though all his income may be taxed at the source. If he has no unearned income he must say *nil*. At present also he is under no penalty, because he is under no statutory obligation to make it. I propose to make it compulsory in all cases that the return shall be made. In the next place, we shall increase the penalties and extend the period of recovery in cases of evasion. In the third place, we shall require extended returns from all employers, whether private persons or companies, requiring them to give not only the names but the salaries of their *employés*. This will, of course, impose a slight additional burden on the employers, but the precaution will tend enormously to prevent evasion. Further, I propose to repeal Section 133 of the Act of 1842, which allows an abatement of duty at the end of the year of assessment where it is found that the profits of that year fall short of the average of the previous three years. I may add also, as the representative of a Scottish constituency, that as the delay in the collection is almost entirely due to the persons directly assessed—the persons to whom we are going to give relief—we intend that the English machinery shall be levelled up, so that it may with equal efficiency correspond to the admirable machinery at work in Scotland. In order to make the matter clear I should like to point out how the system will work by a concrete instance. I take the amount of income-tax payable on certain incomes under the present and proposed scale. First of all I will take an income of £1,500 a year. At present, whatever may be the source of that income, at the rate of 1s. in the pound it pays £75. Under the new system, if the income is derived wholly from the Funds, it will continue to pay at the rate of 1s. in the pound, or £75. If, however, it is derived wholly from a profession or a trade, it will pay at the lower rate of 9d., or £56 5s. If, on the other hand, it is a composite income, say £500 from the Funds and £1,000 from a profession or trade, it will pay 1s. on the £500 and 9d. on the other portion, or £62 10s. instead of £75. Now as to the abatements. I will take an income of £600. At present such an income is allowed a deduction of £120, so that income-tax is paid on £480 irrespective of the sources of income. Under the new system how will it work out? If the income of £600 is derived wholly from the Funds, it will pay £24; if wholly from a profession or trade, it will pay £18, at the rate of 9d. per pound, coupled with an abatement; and if the income is made up of £200 from the Funds and £400 from a profession or trade, it will pay £20 10s., the abatement of £120 being deducted from professional earnings.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Is the abatement in the case of the mixed income always to be made from the earned portion and not from the unearned?

*MR. ASQUITH: Yes, from the earned portion. The effect of this change will be a very sensible relief to that class of income-tax payers who are grievously oppressed by the present burdens, and it will enable us, with a clear conscience and with much greater ease and simplicity of working, to treat the income-tax, as I intend it should be treated, as a permanent part of our fiscal machinery.

GRADUATION OF INCOME-TAX.

There was another point in connection with this question referred to the Committee presided over by my right hon. friend—the practicability of graduation, whether by progression upwards from the normal tax by an ascending scale for higher incomes, or by degression from the normal rate by a descending scale to a lower rate. On this point there was a considerable divergence of opinion in the Committee, and I may say at once that, quite apart from other reasons, it would not be possible for administrative reasons to introduce any change in graduation simultaneously with the already sufficiently complicated alterations of a differentiated tax. The machinery would break down under the strain. I do not announce at this moment any final opinion on the various schemes submitted to the Committee. I see, as everyone conversant with the national finance must see, enormous difficulties in the application of that principle. It would require a compulsory declaration of income from everyone. I should like to see it very much; but how are we to get it? Only by giving an advantage for it. You get a compulsory declaration now where abatements are claimed. Under the scheme of differentiation you will have no difficulty, because it will be to a man's interest to make the declaration. But the moment you come to tell a man, "You are to declare your income, not for your benefit, but in order that you may be taxed at a higher rate," you find yourself confronting a good many formidable difficulties. As to the experience of foreign countries, in my opinion there is no foreign or colonial experience which is really relevant or helpful. I do not mean because our social and economic conditions are very different. But you will find, if you examine the various systems of so-called graduation, that they all stop at a comparatively low point. Most of them stop at £5,000. As far as I know, none of them go beyond £8,000. That is just about the point where, by compulsory declaration, we should hope to rake in for income-tax a lot of money that we do not now receive. But I am not now expressing a final judgment in the matter. I am pointing out difficulties which must be present to the minds of all who have considered the question; and, as far as the present year is concerned, we must be content with the reforms of differentiation.

COST OF NEW SCHEME.

What will be the cost? This, I may say, is a very opportune moment for making a change of this kind, because, as the Committee will observe from the estimated revenue for the year, we are anticipating an increased receipt from income-tax next year of no less than £900,000. That is a time when we may well be able to risk a little in the way of cost. Nothing is more remarkable in respect of the income-tax, notwithstanding the growing abatements and the rise in the rate of charge, than the growing produce of a penny. In the year before the war, 1898, Sir Michael Hicks Beach completed the present system of abatements up to £700; and the income-tax then stood at 8d. in the pound. Notwithstanding these abatements and the fact that the tax is now at 1s. in the pound, the produce of each penny, which was £2,284,000 in 1898, is now £2,600,000—a remarkable proof of the elasticity of this tax. But it is very difficult to estimate either a possible gain or a possible loss on this tax; though its tendency for many years has been in an upward direction. There are, perhaps from 800,000 to 850,000 persons with incomes between £160 and £700 a year. There are, perhaps, 120,000 taxpayers with incomes between £700 and £2,000 a year. How much of their incomes is earned and how much unearned is largely a matter of conjecture. Therefore, the figure I give must be taken more or less as guess-work. But I estimate, from the best materials available, the loss during the year from this differentiation at £1,250,000. Further, during this first year there will be an additional loss, which will not recur, owing to the delay which must necessarily result in getting in the tax in the early months of next year owing to the more complicated machinery. We anticipate that we ought for safety's sake to reckon that we may be delayed to the extent of £750,000 in the collection. That would make a loss for the year of £2,000,000. But you must set against that the fact that we shall get £900,000 more this year, according to our estimate; and the £750,000 is only a deferred payment and not an actual loss. As I say I do not present it to the Committee as more than a well-founded guess; but I hope it is an outside estimate of the loss.

DEATH DUTIES.

With many apologies for the long time that I am detaining the House, I approach the last chapter of my task. The very substantial relief that I am giving to the income-earner necessarily suggests the question whether, at the other end of the scale, property is contributing its fair proportions. As I said some time ago, I cannot, with a view to the needs of the immediate future, afford any substantial loss of revenue, and I must add that, even if I had not to deal with the income-tax at all, I should have felt myself bound to invite the Committee to consider a revision of the death duties. Whether, and how far, those duties ought to be regarded as a sort of deferred income-tax is a controverted economic problem on which I do not desire to enter. But, at any rate, they are *in pari materia;* and, indisposed as I am, not only to lose revenue, but to disturb the balance between direct and indirect taxation —and, remember, I am doing nothing directly this year for the indirect taxpayer—unwilling as I am to disturb that balance in favour of direct taxation, I am going unhesitatingly to ask the Committee to inquire with me whether the greater part of what I have lost or may lose in making the income-tax just and equitable may not be recovered without injustice or lack of equity in another way from the owners of property. We all remember the gloomy predictions uttered in this House at the time the late Sir William Harcourt imposed the death duties in 1894. We were told that they would check the accumulation of capital and drive it out of the country; that people would have to shut up their country houses and curtail the area of employment for honest and industrious men; that the foreign millionaire would no longer make England his home, or, at any rate, the place of his death. None of these predictions has been verified by the event. It used to be said of a great landowner in the West of England, at the time of the repeal of the Corn Laws, that he was convinced that he was going to be ruined, and went about saying that he must make economies if he were to continue to live. After a time, a friend asked him what form his economies had taken, and he replied, "I have put down my pew." I am not at all sure that a revision of the death duties ever had so prejudicial an effect as that on the spiritual welfare of the upper classes. I doubt very much whether they have at all curtailed their contributions to the weekly offertory. But I am satisfied, after a great deal of investigation, that we may, without injury to property, without checking the accumulation of capital, and without injustice to any human being, reconsider the scale of duties imposed in 1904. I propose to leave the scale as it is up to £150,000. The unfortunate man who is unable to leave more than £150,000 will remain in exactly the same position as he is to-day. But when the principal value of the estate exceeds £150,000 and does not exceed £250,000, I propose that the rate of duty shall be 7 per cent. instead of 6½ per cent.; from £250,000 to £500,000 it shall be 8 per cent. instead of 7 per cent.; from £500,000 to £750,000, 9 per cent. instead of 7½ per cent.; from £750,000 to £1,000,000, 10 per cent. instead of 7½ per cent.; and when the estate exceeds £1,000,000, 10 per cent. on the first million. And here I introduce a new element, or what is called, in another connection, a super-tax. I propose that when a man's income exceeds £1,000,000—I do not know what we ought to do with such a man. When a man's estate which passes at his death exceeds £1,000,000, but does not exceed £1,500,000, I propose that it should pay 10 per cent. on the first million, and an additional 1 per cent., or 11 per cent. in all, upon the remainder; if the estate exceeds £1,500,000, and does not exceed £2,000,000, it will pay 10 per cent. on the first million and an additional 2 per cent., or 12 per cent. in all, on the amount in excess of £1,000,000; if it exceeds £2,000,000, and does not exceed £2,500,000, the tax will be as before, 10 per cent. on £1,000,000, but 13 per cent. on the balance; between £2,500,000 and £3,000,000 it will be 10 per cent. on £1,000,000, with 14 per cent. on the remainder, and above £3,000,000 everything in excess of the first million (which will still bear 10 per cent.) is to be taxed 15 per cent. There we stop. I need not point out, what I think must be clear to the Committee, that this applies not to the living, but to the dead. I shall be asked, of course, the pertinent question—and the answer to it will show the extreme moderation of my scheme—What addition will this make to the revenue of the country? Death Duties in former years were very uncertain, and therefore we must take an average. I estimate the average extra proceeds from the increased scale of Death Duties will be £1,200,000 a year. I ought to add that I propose that the new scale shall apply to all estates that pass by death after to-day. But it will be obvious to the Committee that, in consequence of the delay in winding up estates, the new scale will only operate practically for a few months of the present year. Therefore, for the present year, I think it is wise not to anticipate a larger receipt than £600,000 from this source; but the ultimate annual receipt I estimate at £1,200,000.

BALANCE SHEET.

I am now able to present a balance-sheet showing how I have dealt with the surplus up to this point. The surplus of revenue over expenditure is £3,233,000. If you add to that the addition to the Death Duties of £600,000 you bring it up to £3,833,000. The cost for the year of the proposed change on the income-tax is estimated at £2,000,000. This leaves a still disposable surplus of £1,833,000. The odd figure of £333,000 I will keep in hand for the contingencies of the year—not an excessive amount for the purpose. As regards the other £1,500,000 I propose to add it to the New Sinking Fund, making a fixed provision for the year of £29,500,000. Why do I do that? I have said I am not going to part with revenue, and I think the arrangements I have made are such as to show that I shall not suffer in revenue from the Budget proposals. I cannot part with this £1,500,000. I shall need the money for the future. I shall need it next year. In the meantime I make the best investment I can by diminishing *pro tanto* our national obligations. We recognise that the income-tax is a fiscal engine with which we cannot dispense. But we shall remove from it its greatest blot by giving effective relief in the form of a lower rate of charge to that class of incomes on which it presses most heavily. We shall have made a substantial, but not, as I have shown, an excessive addition to the toll which the State exacts from large estates which pass at death. We shall have fulfilled to a degree never attained, or even attempted, before on the same scale in any single year the discharge of debt.

Then in regard to the future. There are urgent, long-delayed, and overdue problems of social reforms; and we shall have begun to provide the nucleus of a fund for the relief of necessitous old age. I shall have in hand next year, free and earmarked for the purpose, the £1,500,000 to which I have just referred, together with the uncollected arrears of this year's income-tax, amounting to £750,000, which will make a total of at least £2,250,000, and an additional sum from the increased estate duties. I count with confidence on further economies in expenditure; and let me add, as time goes on, nowhere with more hope than in the department of expenditure for the relief of the poor. And if I expect economies from my colleagues I appeal for them with still more emphasis to this House. You cannot have everything at once, or everything together; but if you have set your purpose, as I believe you have, and as we have, on this greatest and most urgent of social reforms, you must be willing to sacrifice, or, at any rate, to postpone other forms of useful and even beneficent expenditure. Nor are the resources of taxation, within free trade, yet exhausted. I make no prophetic estimate as to the future. There must always be in our calculations a place for the unforeseeable and the unforeseen. There are what we call accidents, shiftings, mutations, and vicissitudes of fortune, from which States are no more exempt than are the men and women who compose them. But, subject to those necessary reservations, I ask the House to sanction proposals which are intended to open the gate and straighten the way to a better and brighter future for our people.

TEA.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Customs duty now charged on tea shall continue to be charged until the first day of July nineteen hundred and eight (that is to say) tea, the pound, 5d."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is almost superfluous on my part to praise the right hon. Gentleman on the merits of his speech, but I am sure I am speaking for the Whole House when I say that we have listened with pleasure to his statement, and with admiration to its form. But I am glad to think that I can go further than that and say that as to a considerable part of it at any rate I find myself in no great disagreement with the right hon. Gentleman either in his survey of the situation or some of the changes he proposes. I do not propose at this moment to examine in any detail the financial scheme he has unfolded, still less to follow in that way the statement which the right hon. Gentleman has just made, but I should like to make a few observations upon that statement. Let me say at the beginning that I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the credit of the country has been needlessly disparaged in some quarters, and that it is of course a patent fact that, when you allow for the change of the rate of interest, it not only stands to-day higher than that of any other country in the world, but that it stands higher than it did except on rare occasions in our own history. And, Sir, I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that, having regard to present conditions, it is expedient and desirable that special provision shall be made for the reduction of Debt. I am not one of those who think the permanent provision which we have made, especially when it is strengthened with considerable sums coming from the old Sinking Fund is insufficient as a continuous charge, but I do think that in the circumstances of the present time there are special reasons why we should increase that charge. I rejoice that the right hon. Gentleman has utilised a portion of the surplus which he anticipates in the year now entered upon for the reduction of Debt, but I must say, because it is the first time I have had the pleasure of speaking in the right hon. Gentleman's presence on the matter, though I had a passage-of-arms with his right hon. friend on the War Estimates —I must say that I regret that the right hon. Gentleman abstracted £500,000 of what would have normally gone to the Sinking Fund for the purpose of carrying out the scheme adumbrated by the Secretary of State for War, for setting the Volunteers free from their liabilities, He intercepted that money which would have otherwise gone to the reduction of Debt, and the country remains burdened with debt from which, except for this extraordinary and unprecedented proceeding it would have been relieved. With another part of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals I am in complete sympathy, and I think I can promise him for myself and my friends, on the lines he has laid down, co-operation in dealing with the subject of local taxation, and his attempts to place the grants from Imperial taxation in favour of local rates, on a sound and substantial footing. Nothing could be more complicated or unsatisfactory than our system as it now stands, and as it has been described to the Committee by the right hon. Gentleman, and provided he takes care to secure that by his treatment the local authorities shall not be the losers either in the present or in the future, by the change that he proposes, I do not think he will meet with any opposition from this side. I hope he will go a little further and see whether it is not in the power of the Exchequer of the Government to secure some further control over the expenditure to which they contribute, or at any rate to see that the contributions they make go to the purposes for which they are intended. A grant is given and grants have been given over and over again in relief of local taxation, but have any local rates ever been more than momentarily reduced thereby? Is it not the common experience that within a short time of the contribution having been given to local taxation the rates have risen again to the height at which they were and even beyond that figure? There is no limit to local taxation except the limit put upon it by the patient or impatient ratepayer. It is worth considering whether in any change that is made in local taxation we can secure that the money given in relief of local taxation does go in reduction of taxation, and does not go towards encouraging local authorities in embarking in further unnecessary expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman has, as he said, made a statement covering a wider range than is usual on this occasion, and the Committee is the gainer by it. I thing it is a wise and prudent thing that we should from time to time take stock of our position, not merely as it affects one year but as it affects a series of years, as far forward as a Government or a Chancellor of the Exchequer may be expected to look. It is doubly necessary when the Chancellor of the Exchequer sees before him very heavy calls for new expenditure, and wishes to provide for new expenditure for which he cannot provide in the present year, but which he can only hope to provide for by gradually building up a fund with which to meet it. I do not think the review which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made of our resources is altogether an encouraging one, and it was at this part of his speech, no doubt necessary for purposes of his own, that the right hon. Gentleman quitted that dispassionate and non-partisan air which Chancellors of the Exchequer are apt to adopt in Budget speeches, and indulged in rhetoric and fireworks on the subject of free trade. I say "fireworks" because I do not wish to use a harsher phrase. I might borrow the phrase of the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and say that the right hon. Gentleman indulged in terminological inexactitudes. What was the situation he disclosed? That there was an ever-growing demand for social reform; a demand the growth of which was typified by his illustration of what has happened in connection with our expenditure on education, which in a period of about thirty-five years has risen from under £750,000 to £25,000,000. I echo what the right hon. Gentleman said that so far as that money is spent in providing education for the children without extravagance, and without waste, there is not one of us who would wish to cut it down. But there may be there, as some of us think there is in other cases, some expenditure for which we do not get an adequate return. So far as it serves the purpose to which it is devoted there is not one of us who desires to reduce it or who believes it can be reduced if you are to make economy, because as fast as you make an economy other growths will come up. As it is with other social reforms, the inevitable tendency is to grow. They begin with a small figure and inevitably grow. What are the resources out of which we have to meet them? The right hon. Gentleman said the revenues of receipts of last year are in some respects curious. They certainly are. I think he might add that they are to some extent disquieting. The right hon. Gentleman's great increase is in the Death Duties, and as he said himself very fairly, though they tend to average themselves over a series of years they are very uncertain in any year, from the point of view not of the condition of the tax, but of the consideration of the tax as an engine of revenue. The right hon. Gentleman also said that last year was a year of singular prosperity in trade, of increased profits and of growing wages. I do not think the wages have grown very much hitherto, I am not quite sure in what sense the right hon Gentleman used the term. There has been some growth in employment, and therefore some increase of wages paid, but I do not think the Board of Trade Returns show a very marked increase in the wages paid, although there has been some movement in that direction. But the greater the prosperity, the greater the sum paid in wages, the greater you would expect the revenue to be in articles of Customs and Excise. But those Returns are not satisfactory. We do not see in the Customs and Excise the evidence of abundant wealth or widespread prosperity which the Chancellor of the Exchequer finds, I suppose, in a survey of other facts and figures. I think the lack of growth in these items is rather disquieting. It produces this result, that while the Chancellor of the Exchequer is anxious to reduce taxation and to provide funds for social reforms, he is obliged to say the second object kills the first, and he cannot offer any remission of taxation. That is the doctrine I and my friends have been preaching for years; but the right hon. Gentleman denounces his opponents for defending a course he himself continues to pursue. To the consumer it does not matter whether one Chancellor takes a revenue from tea or sugar or another Chancellor takes it from corn. We have admissions as to hopes for social reform—in particular, old-age pensions; but on grounds of statesmanship and fiscal stability, you ought not to attempt to cary out those great measures, principally for the benefit of the poorer amongst us, wholly at the expense of those who are better to do in the world. I think his admissions will be useful, and he will find that the scarecrow, with which he has for a time succeeded in frightening the people, will lose its effect the next time he waves it over the electoral field. As regards the right hon. Gentleman's proposal to graduate the income-tax by means of a super-tax or other taxes, I observe that he did not decline ever to look into the matter again, but he indicated, at any rate, clearly and succinctly, the very great difficulty which would attend the practical application of any proposal of the kind. What he proposes, I think, at first sight appeals to all of us. He takes extreme cases on either side, for the purpose of illustration. He takes the case of a man who has £1,000 a year derived from Consols, and the case of another man who has £1,000 a year derived from his personal exertions. He asks, is it fair that you should tax these two men on exactly the same basis? I think all of us will feel that it is desirable to make a distinction between these two cases, but there is a little doubt whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be able to make the tax much fairer by the proposal which he has put forward. He will remove certain anomalies, but I think he will not remove anomalies altogether; I think he will only change the anomalies which are perpetrated instead of removing them from the tax. I was rather surprised in this connection that the Chancellor of the Exchequer made no reference to the evidence given by the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue before the Income-Tax Committee—evidence remarkably interesting, full of thought and value, in particular that part of it which dealt not only with the attempt at graduation, but with the question of differentiation, which was carried out by the present combination of Death Duties with income-tax. The right hon. Gentleman said he would not go into the question of the Death Duties, or whether they were deferred income-tax or not. I confess I do not think they are. I think that properly they are anticipated income-tax, collected from the heir at the moment he enters on the inheritance, and he has to make that good during the time he is in enjoyment of the property, always assuming that he is prepared to maintain the profits of the property, and is not prepared to see them gradually wasting away. If that be so, the Death Duties are in fact anticipated income-tax. The income-tax is collected not from the dead man after his death, but from the heir in anticipation of his enjoying the income. The moment you take the Death Duties as well as the income-tax into account, you have already a great difference between the taxing of a man who is receiving £1,000 a year from Consols and the taxing of a man who is earning £1,000 a year from his own exertions. The capital sum represented by £1,000 a year from Consols is taxed for Death Duties, and is taxed when the capital passes again. The capital represented by a man's life and strength, that is to say, what gives effect to and enables him to make his personal exertions, is not taxed, but only such money as he may have laid by at the time. I admit, nevertheless, that it is very tempting to endeavour to make a distinction between earned and unearned income. I am not, however, at all sure that the right hon. Gentleman has succeeded in distinguishing fairly between them. I am not quite clear what he proposes to do with a certain large class of property which he himself did not mention, but which he will perhaps be good enough to refer to when he speaks later in the evening. Under what category does he treat pensions? Will the civil servant's pension, which he has earned by his labours for the State, but for which he has ceased to labour, be treated as earned or unearned income? What about life interests of any kind? What about annuities? Are they to be treated as earned or unearned income? From the point of view of the recipient they are not in the same position as the money received from personal exertions; that is to say, that from the point of view of the receiver the income dies when the person dies. Of course, those incomes are derived probably from permanent investments; it is only the interest of the living person that dies with his death; the permanent investment still exists, and the interest becomes someone else's. How does the right hon. Gentleman propose to deal with that? It is obvious that we are only at the beginning of the subject, and that before we part from it we shall have to go into all those cases.

Mr. ASQUITH: There will be the definition clause,

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There will be a definition clause, but the right hon. Gentleman will have not merely to define, but to justify his definitions; he will not merely have to draw a line by putting it in one particular place rather than another. Again, I wish to refer to a very peculiar class of cases. How does the right hon. Gentleman propose to deal with income derived from land? I assume that he will treat the income of the farmer derived from land as earned income. But suppose the farmer is owner of the land, what will happen then? Is he going to treat as unearned the sum which you would assume to be the rent of the land if it were let, or is he going to treat the whole income as earned if it be farmed by the owner himself? Take the case of a man who is not farming his own land, but makes it his business to do the management of his estate himself, his income being £1,500 a year. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman would wish to answer me at once.

Mr. ASQUITH: It will be more convenient to answer these questions together.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I put the case of a man deriving an income of £1,500 a year from his estate, which he does not farm, but which he manages himself; that is his business; is that income earned or unearned? There must be an answer. Of course, our attitude towards the right hon. Gentleman's proposals must depend very much on his answer. I put two cases. I say the person having a life interest in certain property bringing in a certain sum ought to be treated in the same category as the person who is earning the same sum by his own exertions, because the income in each case is dependent on the life of the possessor and cannot be bequeathed by him to someone else. Then I take the case of a man who owns land, manages his own estate, and derives an income of £1,500 a year, or we will say a sum under £2,000 a year. Why not put him beside the man who is making a similar sum by devoting his time to a manufacturing business? I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman draws any distinction between them, or whether he is prepared, as I think he should be prepared, to treat both on exactly the same footing. No doubt he is considering these matters, and there are other cases about which we shall have to ask him and which he himself will have to consider. I come to the last of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals, the increase of the Death Duties. I do not at all meet him in an attitude of hostility in regard to increased graduation on great fortunes that we see falling in from time to time. I do not wholly agree with him as to all the effects prophesied or which followed from Sir William Harcourt's reform. I think he is mistaken. I think it has tended to remove a certain amount of capital out of this country, it has tended to shut up a certain number of big houses, at any rate temporarily, with the result of very considerable hardship primarily on their possessors, besides distress and disturbance of the whole country-side. I ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider, when he is still further graduating these Death Duties, whether he cannot make some distinction between the taxation of capital which is readily available and capital which is not readily available for its purposes. Nobody can contend that the owners of great estates with their capital invested in the land are in the same position as those who have their money invested in securities or business. Their obligations are much heavier, and the difficulty of realising any portion of their capital is much greater. I have often felt that Sir William Harcourt, when he introduced the death duties, might with very little sacrifice of revenue have alleviated the cases of great hardship which arose under them if he had been willing to do so; and I now ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can do something to relieve the worst cases of hardship under the present duties, which may be cases of even greater hardship under his new duties. I ask him to consider whether he cannot do this without sacrificing any substantial portion of the revenue he hopes to obtain. I said at the commencement of my remarks that I did not intend to go fully into the matters raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-day. A statement of the character and scope of that of the right hon. Gentleman demands much further consideration than can be given to it by the speaker who follows him immediately in debate, and the Opposition will have other opportunities of pressing their views upon him, of examining his reforms, and eliciting information as to the changes he has proposed. For the present I know how limited are the resources with which the right hon. Gentleman is able to deal, how little scope he has, bound as he is, quite unnecessarily, by the declarations of the Party opposite —how little scope he has for enlarging his revenue, and how utterly insufficient is our present basis of taxation to provide the means required for the reforms which we all desired to see undertaken. Even when the right hon. Gentleman is prepared still further to increase the taxation on great fortunes and to increase direct taxation, it is obvious how utterly inadequate our present resources are to meet the needs of the State.

*Mr. GEORGE FABER (York), said there was at any rate no difference of opinion upon either side of the House amongst business men as to the manner in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had dealt with the Sinking Fund and the reduction of the National Debt. Every hon. Member would realise that the late war put the National Debt into a very unfortunate, in fact a calamitous, position, and raised it by £150,000,000. The Sinking Fund was, of course, suspended during the war, but it had now been put upon its full working basis, and by that process the National Debt would be automatically reduced. They were all therefore very grateful to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for restoring the Sinking Fund to a strong position and for carrying to it a further sum of a million and a half sterling from the estimated surplus for the coming year. This year, when the temptation to devote such a surplus to other and more fascinating objects must have been very great, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had sturdily turned his eyes away from such temptation and had added the money to the Sinking Fund. He noticed that there was one exception to the general prosperity, and that was the market for stock and securities. They had only to look round the whole purview of the stock markets to see the enormous shrinkage that had taken place. There had been a shrinkage of at least 25 per cent in the great stocks of the country. Consols in 1899, before the war in South Africa broke out, stood at 106, and now they stood at 86. The blue riband of railway investment stock, the London and North Western Railway 4 per cent. preference stock, stood at 140 before the war and now they stood at 115. There were many reasons for this fall. Why had Consols suffered this great drop? Partly owing to the late Lord Goschen's conversion scheme, which lowered the interest from 3 per cent. to 2¾ per cent. and later to 2½ per cent. At the time Lord Goschen's scheme was regarded as a great financial achievement, but the present position of Consols showed that it had been very disastrous from the point of view of the interests of the country. It was quite true that the national Exchequer saved ¼ per cent to begin with and was now saving ½ per cent., but it was possible to purchase that kind of economy too dearly. By reducing what was described by Lord Beaconsfield as "the sweet simplicity of the 3 per cents." to 2¾ and 2½ per cent. they had shaken out the small investors who were the backbone of Consols and who in the past had been relied upon in times of financial stress. The little men had gone, and who had taken their place? Largely the banks of the country and the Government itself. It was true that those now sitting in Opposition were responsible for the war, and they were quite willing to bear that responsibility. There was another contributing cause to the fall in all first-class stocks, and that was the immense increase which had taken place in municipal expenditure, which now stood at more than half the amount of the National Debt. Why should they be surprised if Consols and other great preference stocks and securities dropped when they continued to water down the whole of the stocks and securities of the country in this way? Then again there had been an immense fall in the value of mining shares in South Africa. Everybody who knew anything about the question of South African mines knew that the shares were held in small lots all over the world, often by people of little means, although no doubt the mines were initiated by capitalists. In the winter of 1904 the stocks of thirty-six of the chief companies stood at £156,000,000 while to-day they were valued at about one-half.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said that half of the companies had watered capital.

*MR. GEORGE FABER said that he knew the hon. Member's views on that topic. They were diametrically opposed to his own. He was pointing out that owing to the agitation against the mines, which had been most ill-advised from the point of view of finance, the value of the shares had fallen. The stocks of railway companies in this country had been immensely depreciated by threats made against them, and legislation apprehended in regard to licensed property had led to an enormous depreciation in the value of such property. He wished to say a few words in regard to a matter which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not touched upon, namely, the gold supply. There had been a great deal of recent discussion about the scarcity of gold and about the gold reserve. Gold was only a commodity just like corn or meat or other marketable articles. The reason why there had been a great scarcity of gold was that during the past year business had been active all over the world with the result that there had been an exceptional demand for gold, and there had not been enough gold to go round. [Cheers.] He was not surprised to hear the cheers of hon. Members below the gangway. He was afraid that the Budget would not make gold circulate any more freely in the direction hon. Members desired. On account of the activity of trade the supply of gold had not been sufficient. The view he had always taken was that this country being still a creditor country only really required gold as a medium of internal exchange, and owing to her cheque system did not require the amount of gold for the transaction of business that some countries required. There had been a cry in many quarters about increasing the gold reserve, but he ventured to think that no such expedient was required.

*The CHAIRMAN: I really do not see the relevancy of these remarks even on a subject so wide as that now before the House.

*Mr. GEORGE FABER thought that, money being the basis of the Budget, he would not be altogether out of order in making some general remarks on that subject. He had the honour of being a member of the Committee which inquired into the question of the income-tax. They all learned a great deal from the inquiries of the Committee, and he did not think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal of differentiation would be disagreeable to any Member who sat on the Committee. But he ventured to think that it would not be found anything like so easy as was imagined to work out the scheme of differentiation which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated to the House. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted the late Mr. Gladstone's objection to differentiation, but that objection applied with equal force now. The right hon. Gentleman did not meet the case at all. The widow's grievance referred to by Mr. Gladstone remained. He instanced the case of a widow with an unearned income of £300 a year, and the case of a grocer with an earned income of the same amount. The widow under the present system of abatements got the benefit of an abatement, but she would not get any differentiation under the new scheme, whereas the grocer got both the abatement and the differentiation. The right hon. Gentleman had not at all got over Mr. Gladstone's objection. Let them look at the matter from another point of view. In the case of a mixed income—partly earned on capital and partly by personal effort—how were they going to differentiate? Cases of that kind could be multiplied, but he would take the case of a doctor who earned £1,000 a year. The doctor had bought the business, and in respect of the capital which he had paid his income would be unearned, while in respect of the personal effort he put into the business his income would be earned. Who was going to differentiate between the two? In the case of any trader who had bought a business with his capital, who was to decide how much of the income was earned and how much was unearned? Was the collector to decide how much of an income was unearned and how much came from personal endeavour? It would give rise to an infinite number of appeals. He was rather sorry to hear the right hon. Gentleman almost laugh at the hardships caused by the higher scale of Death Duties introduced by the late Sir William Harcourt. But apart altogether from millionaires, they all knew that there was a great intermediate class that had been most grievously burdened by those Duties. Let them take the case of a landed estate worth £150,000 on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to increase the Death Duties. It should be remembered that there might be large charges on that estate for the widow and the younger children and very little ready money with which to pay the Duties, thus necessitating a heavy burden of mortgage upon the estate. He did not think any increase on that class of estate was just. The millionaire was supposed to be fair game. That was true from one point of view; but it must not be forgotten that the millionaire was quite as necessary for the financial stability of this country as any other class. Some millionaires might have made their money by their own exertions. There were more who were made, perhaps, than born. The Chancellor of the Exchequer laughed at the idea that the Death Duties drove capital out of the country; but he maintained that that charge was true. Hitherto capital had found comparative security in this country. Capital was a shy bird, a cosmopolitan bird, having no country, but building its nest where it could best find security. If that security was destroyed, capital would go. He doubted whether it was good policy from the individual or the national point of view to increase the Death Duties. It was pointed out by Sir Henry Primrose in his evidence before the Select Committee that the Death Duties worked out on an average at an equivalent to an extra 1s. in the pound income-tax and on millionaire estates to an extra 2s. in the pound.

Mr. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) asked whether the pensions of Civil servants or of naval and military officers would be regarded as deferred pay or accumulated savings? He thought that the duty should have been taken off sugar, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was hardly correct in saying that to take off a small sum from that duty would have had no effect on consumption.

Mr. ASQUITH said he was open to argument as to whether for the purposes of the income-tax pensions should be treated as deferred pay or accumulated savings. That was one of the questions which was discussed by economists in both aspects. He himself was disposed to regard pensions in the light of accumulated savings. A farmer who earned his income would be entitled to pay income-tax at the rate of 9d. instead of 1s. in the £1 if his income was under £2,000 a year.

Mr. GEORGE FABER asked what about the landlord who acted as his own agent?

Mr. ASQUITH said that in the case of a landlord who farmed his own land or acted as his own agent he had to make out his return; and it was for him to show that he was entitled to the low rate because his income was earned.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said he would like to join with the late Chancellor of the Exchequer in offering his congratulations to the right hon. Gentleman on his Budget statement. He believed that a great part of that Budget would be approved of and give satisfaction in the country. The right hon. Gentleman did nothing for indirect taxation. That was good, because last year indirect taxation had been reduced. Something had been taken off the duties on sugar, tea, and corn, but nothing had been taken off the income-tax, although the right hon. Gentleman had associated himself with the opinion of his predecessor that it was impossible to justify or defend an income-tax of 1s. in the pound in a time of peace. However, his first criticism of the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that he ought to have made a general reduction of the income-tax from 1s. in the pound. He was quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman's proposal to reduce the income-tax to 9d. only in certain cases would not have been approved of by Mr. Gladstone, who always regarded that tax as a temporary and not a permanent tax. On one occasion Mr. Gladstone proposed that the income-tax should be imposed for only seven years, and in 1873 that it should be taken off altogether. He contended that the income-tax payers in the country with incomes below £700 had borne more than their fair share of the burden of the war taxation, and at present direct taxation for war expenditure amounted to £15,000,000, and indirect taxation to only £8,000,000. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman said that he would devote the large sum of £1,500,000 to the Sinking Fund, and they were naturally pleased that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should keep that fund up. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to propose to pay off £13,700,000 odd and in addition this £1,500,000 was to be paid into it, so that £15,200,000 was to be devoted to that purpose. He understood however, that this payment of £1,500,000 into the Sinking Fund would not bind the Government to its allocation to the purpose of reduction of Debt next year, the object of the Chancellor of the Exchequer being to form a nucleus of a fund for old-age pensions. He entirely agreed with the basis the right hon. Gentleman had laid down as to this question, viz., that it must be approached step by step, and that they could not at once launch the country into extravagant expenditure. He also agreed that this benefit should be given to persons who were suffering through no fault of their own. It seemed to him that the only safe way to proceed was for the State to contribute a certain amount which should be met by the contribution of a similar sum by the local authorities. On the whole he thought the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was highly satisfactory.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not taken another penny off the tea duty this year. No article had a greater claim upon a Chancellor of the Exchequer, because it was to a large extent raised by British capital in British possessions, and the use of it also forwarded the cause of temperance, while it was the comfort, little luxury, and indeed necessity of the poor. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would consider that, as they had not had the penny remission this year, it was owing to the tea consumers in Great Britain and planters in India and Ceylon, who were our fellow countrymen, to take off 2d. next year. As the right hon. Gentleman had said, the price went up last year, but that was because of the failure of the crops and the depletion of the stores of retailers in anticipation of the Budget. The price of the cheaper teas ran up, he believed, to as much as 3d. a pound more. Another reason for the increase was the active enterprise of those engaged in the tea industry in India, who had endeavoured to develop the German and Russian markets. He himself had taken part in that movement though he had not a penny piece invested in tea. There were other parts of the world, like Finland, where at present coffee was mainly used, but in which tea had only to be introduced to create a trade. If this additional 1d. had been taken off it would have led to a great development of the industry, and have employed more British capital and labour. Another fact was that owing to the large tax which had prevailed in the last few years planters had been discouraged from extending cultivation, and this coupled with the expansion of the market had led to the high price of tea, to the great disadvantage of the poor people of this country. He had hoped that the Chancellor would have taken these matters into account, because if the penny was of no value to the consumer, and did not reach him, as was argued, and the boon which he gave last year was on that account wasted, there was the more reason for a decrease, and what was wanted now was the extra penny to make the boon efficacious. He would not go at greater length into the question of tea, because a memorial had been circulated among Members for which he was in part responsible. He wished however to call attention to the pensions of British officers and civil servants, and would strongly urge that they should be regarded as earned income and deferred pay, and not as accumulated savings handed over by the employers on retirement, and thus come under the lower rate as to income-tax. These people had often had very little pay and were often hard put to it to maintain themselves and their wives and to educate their children. They had been accustomed to some comfort and to a certain position, and he put it strongly that their pensions should come under the most favourable rate. As to the man with an income of £2,000 a year, would he enjoy the more favourable rate in respect of any portion of it which he earned?

MR. ASQUITH: If his income exceeds £2,000 a year he will not enjoy anything.

*MR. REES said he understood that as to the £1,500,000 which was to be placed in the Sinking Fund and was to be the nucleus of a fund for old-age pensions the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to take it out next year or to ear-mark it for this specific purpose.

MR. ASQUITH: I have no power to take it out. I only propose to devote it to that purpose if the House agrees. If they do it will be for Parliament to take it out.

*MR. REES: Yes; but Parliament had power with the Exchequer and the Chancellor had Power with Parliament, and he did not altogether understand how this sum was secured for this purpose. When his hon. friend opposite was speaking he made some remarks which met with considerable disapproval on the Ministerial side. The hon. Gentleman pointed out that the capital of the gold mines in South Africa was was now distributed among a great many small investors of this country and was not the property of capitalists in South Africa. That was true, and he desired to take that opportunity of expressing his concurrence with a statement which any one who would take the trouble to go to the city might verify for himself. There could be no doubt, moreover, that the competition between the

Government and the municipalities on the one hand and private traders on the other must lead to dislocation and difficulty in regard to labour and industry in this country. For instance, if it was right for the Government to give employment as a matter of relief rather than as a matter of business in a particular constituency, such as Woolwich, then it was right and proper to give such employment in other constituencies where there were no Royal Arsenals, one of which was the Montgomery district. There was no justice in giving to one constituency what was not given to another, and the public purse was the property of all constituents.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said he wished first to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman in being able to devote £1,500,000 to the sinking fund, because when the country was in funds as it was at present was the time to do so; it could not be done when we had no money. The right hon. Gentleman had given some reasons for the deplorable state of affairs which he said existed in the stock markets, but there were other reasons which the right hon. Gentleman did not recognise, or at all events did not put before the House. The right hon. Gentleman said the Radicals were pledged to restore the national credit, and referred to wild talk in the newspapers on the price of Consols, and then said that 2½ per cent. stock at 82 was equal to 3 per cent. stock at 100. He quite agreed that there had been about the national credit a lot of wild talk which was not justified, but that was not the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman a year ago. When that argument was used by the Unionist Party the price of Consols was 85, and it was only after the advent of the right hon. Gentleman as Chancellor of the Exchequer that they touched a lower point than they ever touched when the Unionists were in power. Although there was a good deal of point in the contention that the credit of the country had not materially suffered, he did not think the Party of the right hon. Gentleman had redeemed their pledge to restore the national credit. The right hon. Gentleman said that fresh issues had a great deal to do with it; that the trust list had been extended and Colonial securities had been admitted, and that excessive borrowing of municipalities had a great deal to do with it. All that was true, because as they returned a higher interest than Consols, the tendency was to sell Consols and put the money into municipal and Colonial stocks. He did not quite see how the right hon. Gentleman brought in the catastrophe in America, because although it was suggested that a number of stocks were going to be sold by the insurance companies he did not think that ever occurred. The fall in Consols had been going on for some years. The right hon. Gentleman had also alluded to Irish land stock, which certainly affected the price of Consols. And it should not be forgotten that while the right hon. Gentleman had reduced the National Debt by £13,000,000 he had issued large amounts of Irish land stock which was just as much a part of the National Debt as Consols. He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman was not really responsible for the issue of Irish land stock. He himself voted against the issue of stock for the purchase of Irish land, and he believed that if the thing had been done properly no special stock would have been issued but Consols. What was the use of buying up Consols which paid £2 16s. per cent. and issuing Irish land stock at £3 5s. per cent. That represented a loss of 9s. to the taxpayer, and such a proceeding could not be justified by any principle of sound finance. Another reason for the drop in Consols and other securities generally was that at one time people were content to invest in English securities because they thought that though the interest was low the security was undeniable, and they would not invest in foreign securities because they thought the security was not so good. He was sorry to say that owing to the action of the Party opposite there was a strong impression in the minds of people who had money that it was better to invest it out of England. That was another reason for the fall in Consols, as he was able to prove. It was a fact well known to every stockbroker in the City of London. He asked the right hon. Gentleman in all seriousness to investigate that statement, and, if he found it was true, to do something to strengthen stocks in the stock market and do away with that want of confidence which prevailed in the case of English stocks. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman was going to put employers to the trouble of stating the wages paid to all their employees, because it would put a very great tax upon them, especially on such companies as railway companies, who employed sometimes as many as 20,000 men. It would entail very great labour.

MR. ASQUITH said the idea was not his. he had taken it from Lord Ritchie.

SIR F. BANBURY said that everybody was liable to make mistakes, and Lord Ritchie was as liable as anyone else. As this was not the idea of the right hon. Gentleman he hoped he would not persist in it. They must not forget also that the income-tax was instituted as a war tax, and that it was desirable from the Government's point of view to keep it as low as possible in order that they might have a little in reserve for times of emergency. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the points that had been put to him.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln) said he wished to draw attention to the statement of the Chancellor of the Excheqer that the decline in the consumption of alcoholic liquors, of which he told them last year, had now suffered a check, and that there had been a slight but distinct set back. The drink Bill had gone up some £2,000,000 in the last year. The effect of his statement last year in which he traced the decline of the drink Bill from the year 1899 onward was to produce in the minds of many Members and of the country as a whole the sense that everything was going on all right, that all was for the best in the best of all possible licensing worlds, and that this very difficult problem might be left to settle itself. However, if they took a retrospect of ten years, this diminution practically disappeared, and if they went back further, it would be found that they were drinking more to-day than they did, say forty years ago. It was impossible to leave this question on one side, and he felt convinced that the Government did not mean to leave it undealt with. Now, some of them had been looking to the Budget statement with eyes of hope, and they were glad that there was going to be the alteration in the licence duties under which they would be recovered for the National Exchequer, and no longer go for the relief of local rates. That was, administratively, a great improvement, and they were glad that the step was going to be taken. At the present time, in some cases, local authorities could get £5,000 or £7,000 on the grant of new licences, in relief of rates, and it was very desirable indeed that that temptation should be taken away from the local authorities, and that these sums, which really were not due so much to local action as to the general policy of the State, should be recovered for the Exchequer. But they could not help wishing that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had seen his way to go further in the matter. The case was overwhelming for a revision of the licence duties. When Mr. Gladstone introduced the revision of the licence duties in 1880, he based it on the principle that Parliament had been engaged for years past in bolstering up monopolies and in adding to the artificial value which attached to public-house property, and which in his opinion were the most deadly and inveterate enemies with which temperance reformers had to deal. The principle referred to by Mr. Gladstone in 1880, after the act of 1904 which for the first time recognised a continuing interest in the licence, would in itself have justified a further revision, and a much more severe graduation of the licence duties. Many temperance reformers had altered their view in reference to that matter. In the past they were suspicious of raising more revenues from this trade; but now that the State, by the Act of 1904, recognised a continuing interest in the licence, it was borne in upon the minds of temperance reformers that the charging of a real licence duty and not the sort of peppercorn rent charged at the present time, would have a substantial effect in reducing the excessive number of licences, and especially that undesirable class of licences, which were merely on the margin of subsistence, and might very properly be put an end to. That was the reason why some of them were anxious for this revision of the duties. But under this Budget, at all events, they could not get the Reforms which might have come out of the revision of the duties. The Chancellor of the Exchequer held out hopes that it might come next year. "Man never is but always to be blessed." Some of them were tired of endless postponement, and he would like to convey to the mind of the Government that there was a growing feeling of impatience and anxiety at the delay in dealing with the question of temperance reform. If nothing could be done in the Budget there was increased urgency for dealing with the question by other means, and he hoped that the Government would, in framing their plans for the coming session, bear in mind that so far nothing had been done to redeem the strong assurance given by the Prime Minister last year that he would grapple with the problem of licensing reform. One further reflection occurred to him. If the duties were not revised this year, they retained at least in their hands a weapon over which the House of Commons had complete control. Licensing reforms were usually bitterly attacked, and, so far as legislation was concerned, they knew that the House of Commons had not complete control as it had over matters of taxation; he did not, however, think that the licensing reforms of the Government, when they were finally proposed, would suffer shipwreck in another place, but if that did happen, he hoped that the Government would not scruple when the time came to use their power over taxation, by which, at all events, they could accomplish some small instalments of temperance reform which had been so long delayed.

*MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) said that though they had heard a clear statement from the right hon. Gentleman, yet he must confess that it was not satisfying, and it left a great deal over to another occasion. So far as he was able to judge, after listening to the statement, they were already confronted with an expenditure of £119,000,000, and there seemed no prospect in the near future of any reduction of that expenditure. On the contrary, the right hon. Gentleman was unable to give them any hope of a reduction of taxation; he had to keep all he had got, and probably there might be further inroads on the taxpayers in future. A considerable amount of legislation had been promised, and only a very small proportion of it had yet been placed before the House. The general experience now was that legislation usually meant money. None but Members of the Government knew anything about the proposed legislation. Two important Bills for Ireland were named in the King's Speech, and they did not know whether they would involve any charge upon the taxpayers or simply mean a reallocation of sums already voted. Then there was the proposal of the Secretary for War, whose scheme for a Territorial Army must prove very costly, and he would like to know what provision had been made with regard to that. With reference to the principal point of the Budget, he thought the right hon. Gentleman was to be congratulated on the intention to recover the licences into his own hands. With regard to the new proposals which the right hon. Gentleman had laid before the House making a differentiation in the death duties, he would like him to consider seriously whether something could not be done to give a further reduction in the case of estates, where the greater part of the owner's income might be derived from land. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a little too sanguine when he ridiculed some of those prophecies which were put forward when Sir William Harcourt introduced his great reform. He believed that the death duties had caused the withdrawal of a certain amount of capital, and undoubtedly there had been a tendency in many places, if not to close estates, to spend less money upon their development than would have been the case but for the heavy burdens which had been placed upon them. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the various classes of property which had to bear these heavy burdens, and that he would be able to make a differentiation in favour of landed estates. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on what he had done with regard to the income-tax, and still more on what he had not done. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, he hoped, would not depart from the lines which he had laid down. With regard to the super-tax he was pleased that the right hon. Gentleman had not finally made up his mind, and that he had left the principle of the graduation of the income-tax to be dealt with upon some other occasion. He hoped that during the interval any consideration he might give to these questions would not induce him to make any departure from the lines he had laid down. The imposition of a super-tax must entail a full declaration in regard to all incomes from whatever source, and that course would not only be resented, but it might prove extremely disastrous to the tax as a whole. He would advise those hon. Members who expected to see a large amount of revenue raised through a graduation of the income-tax to read the admirable memorandum presented to the Committee by the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue. The idea of graduation had a certain amount of attraction about it, but when it was examined in detail and thoroughly threshed out it would be found not only that it would prove very irksome to the country, but that it would have a most disastrous effect upon the revenue. To draw distinctions between the various classes of income-tax payers was open to considerable objection. He did not know any distinction which would not be open to some objection, but from the experience which he gathered on that Committee and from the evidence which they heard he thought the line the Chancellor of the Exchequor had taken was the one least open to objection. On the whole it was the fairest, and although there must and would be innumerable hard cases, still he was of opinion that if the House of Commons was determined to adopt any distinctions of that character that which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had drawn was perhaps the best. They would, of course, wait to see his definition clause before offering further criticism, and they would have to discuss further the Budget as a whole. In conclusion he wished to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon not having allowed himself in dealing with the income-tax to be led away from really sound principles of finance by any plans however attractive they might seem.

Mr. ASQUITH suggested that the Committee should pass the non-contentious Resolutions, and that the general discussion should be taken on Monday, when the Resolutions relating to income-tax, death duties, or local taxation were brought up.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought that was a fair offer, and he had no objection to that course being taken.

*Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh Central) asked whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended that the notices issued for the collection of the income-tax should be issued in September in Scotland. He thought that course would cause a great deal of difficulty, and if there could be some intimation that the notices would not be issued until after the payment of the November term rent it would prevent a great deal of trouble. These notices in Scotland were different from those issued in England, and, if without giving the exact words, the right hon. Gentleman would assure them that those notices would be issued in precisely the same form in England as in Scotland, they would feel no injustice. With regard to the tea duty, he was glad that there had not been a reduction of one penny per pound, because he thought it was a mistake last year to take off a penny. When the tea duty was reduced only by a penny the consumers did not receive any benefit at all. The primary object of the House of Commons in dealing with such questions ought to be to see that whenever a reduction was made it was done in such a way as to ensure that it did benefit those who were intended to be benefited. With regard to taxes on food, he did not gather that even next year the Chancellor of the Exchequer held out no hope that any changes would be made. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had laid the foundation for a complete alteration in the finances of the country, and he congratulated him upon his proposals. He approved of the alteration suggested in the system of local taxation, but he was not in favour of giving grants in aid.

*Colonel R. WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said the right hon. Gentleman had spoken a good deal about the solid and growing prosperity of the country. He wished he could feel as optimistic as the right hon. Gentleman did as to the probability of that prosperity lasting. He thought there was a great deal which was not so solid in our trade as could be wished, and a good many of the symptoms in the country did not portend the continued prosperity for which they all hoped. When talking of his scheme of social reform, the right hon. Gentleman, he was glad to hear, paid due regard to the importance of character as a basis of the prosperity of the country. He welcomed those words as representing the considered opinions of His Majesty's Government, because they would tend to allay a good deal of alarm as to what might be called social reforms, which might possibly alter some of our social conditions, and certainly not improve the prospects of the country, by leading rather to dependence on Government than on one's own force and strength of character. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would carry out his scheme of old-age pensions. He himself had always been an advocate of old-age pensions. He had watched the driving power in favour of old-age pensions gradually growing, and he was glad to think that it was coming near the time when they would be able to accomplish something, though he hoped it would not be all that was expected in some quarters. The great difficulty to his mind in regard to old-age pensions was the fear of sapping self-reliance and lessening the inducement to lay by in younger years. He therefore specially welcomed what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said about self-reliance in all schemes of social reform. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would carry out the principle of self-reliance in another matter which he mentioned. He congratulated him on having the boldness to deal with the local taxation account. While that account was well conceived in intention, its use had been so altered that it had been nothing but an incubus to our national finance. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman in granting subventions to local authorities would lay down that the grants would depend on whether it appeared from their management of their affairs that the local authorities deserved them. One of the great merits of the scheme propounded by the Committee on the Reform of Local Taxation, presided over by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, was that the amount of the subventions from the Consolidated Fund to local authorities would be regulated by their deserving them, the subventions being larger with the poverty of a district as proved by the smallness of the amount produced by a penny rate, and with the economy with which the local affairs were administered, as proved by the lowness of the poor rate. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated in the course of his speech that war taxes ought to be applied to the paying off of war debt. He was sure all Members of the House agreed in that. The right hon. Gentleman had further stated that the war taxes produced at present about £20,000,000. If that was so, the right hon. Gentleman had fallen away from his own dictum, for in this year he had been paying off only £15,000,000. Like the right hon. Gentleman, he was very much in favour of the reduction of Debt, but he was not sure that he agreed with what was proposed to be done this year. One plan which the right hon. Gentleman had proposed for the alteration of the incidence of the income-tax, removed the burden from only a small portion of the number of the taxpayers. It would relieve part of the burden from about 210,000 payers of the tax out of about 850,000, or not quite a quarter. It had been stated that this would absorb some £600,000; in addition to which £1,500,000 were paid off the Debt. But these two sums together amounted to £2,100,000, or nearly 1d. on the income-tax, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had remitted the 1d. from the whole of the payers of the tax, he would have provided a larger reserve in case of need in the ability to reimpose the penny. He would not go into all the difficulties in regard to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme of differentiation. He thought the principle of making a differentiation between earned and unearned income was as sound as any differentiation could be—probably more sound and defensible than most, if not all, the others. Of course it would lead to a great many difficulties. He imagined that the greatest difficulty would be in the framing of the definition clause in the Budget Bill dealing with this question. He thanked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the tardy act of justice he had done to a long-suffering class, namely, the beneficed clergy, whose incomes were to be included in the category of earned incomes. There was no doubt that they were freeholders; they were so in right of service, and the amount of their freehold was therefore really earned income. The freeholds were granted in very many cases to the parishes to provide for their spiritual needs. As to the taking of 3d., in the pound off incomes which were earned, he wanted to know whether that was to be a fixed sum. If the income-tax was reduced to 10d. would the earned incomes be taxed at 7½d.? In other words, was the tax on earned incomes always to be 25 per cent. less than that on unearned incomes? If that was so, there was another difficulty which would have to be met. They never dealt with halfpennies in connection with the income-tax, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted to increase the tax it would have to be by 4d. at a time. He did not quite know why the differentiation should be 3d., but if that was to be a fixed sum those who were entitled to it would bear a larger proportion of the burden than those who were not entitled to it in the event of the tax being increased to (say) 1s. 3d. in the pound, and a smaller proportion than their share if it was reduced below 1s.

*MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under Lyne) said he regretted very much that no relief had been given in respect of sugar. In addresses up and down the country, and in answer to deputations, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had expressed himself as freely as any Member of the House on the iniquity of the sugar tax. In a speech delivered to a deputation the right hon. Gentleman said it could only be a temporary tax, and that it would not be made a permanent impost. In the speech delivered to-day the right hon. Gentleman had outlined a scheme of old-age pensions which would come on twelve months hence. He could only conceive of that, and other beneficial measures, being carried out by making the tax on sugar permanent. If that was so, it meant the breaking of pledges which had been made right and left in the country. The sugar tax was put on as a war tax. He agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that after a war they could not pay off the debt all at once. He contended, however, that sugar was just as deserving of relief as tea. [AN HON. MEMBER: More.] He entirely differed from the observations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to the sugar duty and its reduction. There would not be the slightest difficulty in either the wholesale, retail, or manufacturing trade. Every grocer and storekeeper regulated the quality and price of his sugar to a farthing in the lb., and if the sugar duty were reduced one half, the price would be reduced in every shop in the country by a farthing in the lb. Again, the tax on sugar was out of all proportion to its value, amounting to from 35 to 40 per cent., which was a tremendous tax on food and on the raw material of many industries. So much had the tax on sugar been felt that prosperous industrial concerns depending very largely on sugar as the raw material of their manufactures had ceased to pay dividends; and labour employed in these industries, some of them of great magnitude, had suffered very materially. The tax affected not only sugar itself, but a thousand and one articles which were brought to this country. For instance, there was a tax on tins of fruit according to the sugar in them. Then there was the Custom House inspection, which disorganised business. He had seen a gentleman in the lobby that day who told him that the sugar tax put him to an expense of £6,000 a year in a department dealing with the Customs, an expense which he could not possibly get out of his customers. He hoped when the Chancellor of the Exchequer came to reply he would give them to understand that he was not going to look forward to this tax being made permanent. He knew that the directors of great industries in which many millions were locked up, and which were not paying one per cent. on the capital invested, would look at this Budget with great disappointment.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that he could not recall a previous occasion on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had asked the House to agree to his Budget Resolutions after only two hours debate. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was quite fair to the members of the Select Committee on Income-Tax when he said they had practically agreed that it was desirable that they should differentiate the income-tax. He could not think that, because that was not within the terms of their reference which directed them to consider the practicability, not the desirability of it. He would have preferred that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not gone into the scheme of graduation which he had submitted, not because he objected to graduation, but because the scheme would create a large amount of work for the officials without any certainty of that work's being productive. He would have preferred if the right hon. Gentleman had confined graduation and differentiation to the death duties, especially on large estates. There were one or two regrettable omissions from the Budget speech to which he wished to call attention. Last year the Government were prepared to spend a million on what they described as education, although that million would have been devoted entirely to destroying denominational education in voluntary schools. If the Government were as interested in education as they professed to be, he would have looked to their forwarding the interests of education in the country apart from denominational teaching. He maintained that education required further assistance from the Treasury. He had always held that the Bill of 1902 formed an educational ladder by which the children of the poor could climb from elementary to higher education; and to some extent it had fulfilled that idea. But the reason why it had not been more successful was that the duty of providing scholarships was left far too much to local enterprise rather than to contributions from the Imperial Exchequer. The burden consequently fell more heavily on the poorer counties. To his mind it was a mistake in principle that that ladder should be dependent on the local rates rather than on grants from Parliament, and he would have been very glad if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given this year £500,000 to found scholarships in the poorer counties for poor children so as to make the Act of 1902 more effective. There was an entire omission from the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of any reference to the important agricultural industry. A year ago, there was a very fine sentence in the King's Speech, setting out that His Majesty's Government were considering proposals for attracting people to the land, and retaining them upon it. Those proposals did not amount to very much, and this year it was only in the last item but one in the King's Speech that reference was made to a small measure for an alteration of the law affecting small holdings. Looking to the fact that it was almost universally admitted that agriculture bore a higher amount of taxation than any other industry, it could not be expected that people would be attracted to the land, until the land received some relief from taxation. They could not be content with vague proposals. There was no proposal to relieve local taxation further than it had been relieved, and there was no proposal to give any money towards the increase of small holdings. There was another question in connection with the land which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had left out of account, and that was the position of the owners of agricultural land with regard to their assessment for the purposes of income-tax. They had for many years suffered from very great injustice in that respect. For some reason or other the Party opposite never felt themselves in a position to see justice done to anyone who called himself a landlord, and it did not appear likely this year at any rate from what they had heard, unless there had been an omission from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech, that justice was going to be done. The rural landlord, the man who possessed, say, nothing whatever except agricultural land, and that perhaps of no great value in the way of letting, was paying far more in income-tax than any other kind of income-tax payer in proportion to what he had received. There was an arbitrary deduction from his assessment of one-eighth in respect of agricultural land, and the deduction was one-sixth in regard to houses. The latter for a landlord in a town might be a reasonable deduction, but for a landlord in a country district it was absolutely unreasonable and unfair. He did not believe that they could find one landlord in ten in country districts who did not spend more than one-eighth of his gross income upon his property, and he netted nothing like seven-eighths of his total income. Not one of these country landlords had a desire to escape from paying his fair share of the taxation of the country and paying the same share as other people paid. He did not think that anyone could say that the country squire was less patriotic than any other class in the country. He was ready to to pay his fair share, but because he was willing to do so was no reason why justice should not be done to him in this case. It could be done in this way if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would agree to it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he thought it would be an admirable thing if everybody made a declaration of his total income from all sources, and he expressed his keen desire that it should be done by them all, although he said he did not think that it was likely that everybody would do it. At any rate, the owners of agricultural land would have no objection whatever to make that declaration, and he thought it would be only fair to allow them the opportunity of being assessed on the net income which they got out of the land. The best landlords spent most in keeping their property in good order and in doing what they could to help their tenants; and if their property contained a number of small holdings they had to pay more out of their income than other landlords. If the Government were going to say that the man who did most for his land and most for his tenants was to pay more income-tax than anyone else, they would be endorsing a principle which was unjust, and was becoming more unjust every day. If one-eighth was a fair proportion the Government would get a statement to that effect from those who made a declaration of their income, but a vast proportion of the rural landlords spent a great deal more than that, something more like one-half, not in improving their property, but simply in preventing its deterioration. These people ought to be assessed on the money which they pocketed just as much as other people, and justice which had been too long delayed ought to be done to them in the Budget which had been brought in that day. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consider these points he would have his support to his Budget, which in many ways he admired very much, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman had a great opportunity at a time like the present and in a Budget which had received support from all quarters of the House, of redressing these absolutely incontestable grievances which would no doubt have been removed but for the idea that no Liberal Government could do anything in the way of justice for anyone who called himself a landlord.

*Mr. MADDISON (Burnley) said it was necessary to find a justification for a Budget which did nothing to repeal indirect taxation, especially in the case of sugar, which was both a food and a raw material. The tax on sugar operated in an injurious way in both directions, and he confessed he waited for the declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on that point with considerable interest. He had not, however, the slightest difficulty in finding a justification for the Budget, in spite of the non-remission of any indirect taxation, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made it perfectly plain that he was not bringing forward a showy Budget, the chief claim of which would be for the moment to be called popular, but that he was attempting to reorganise our national finance on a sound basis. For many years he had taken a good deal of interest in the promotion of old age pensions on the lines suggested by Mr. Charles Booth, and it was because he was a convinced opponent of State socialism that he had always felt that there was a real case for dealing with the aged poor who, through various causes, found themselves—not by any means all of them helpless, but in such a condition that public money might well be devoted to succouring them in the twilight of their lives. There was a good deal of vague talk indulged in by all classes, including the working classes, who got hold of huge figures and said that with all this wealth surely the Government could bring forward at once an old-age pension scheme. He knew it would be said that the rich had been looked after and the poor had been neglected. Although he had never handled large sums of money, he was sufficiently acquainted with these things to know that national finance had a direct bearing upon the trade of the country, and, after all, the first consideration was to get national finance sound, so that the trade of the country in the operative part of a man's life should also be prosperous. He wished to say he regarded the Budget—much as he would have liked to have seen a remission of the sugar tax or part of it, and much as he would have liked to have seen this year old-age pensions established—as one which would be welcome to the great mass of the people and one which he could support without apology or qualification, because the Chancellor had united two things, namely, sound national finance and social reform. This was the first Budget in which there had ever been a distinct pledge on the part of the Government to introduce during the life of this Parliament and even in the next session, if another House would leave them alone — a measure under which a start would be made with a scheme of old-age pensions. He ventured to say that no reasonable man, and one need not trouble about unreasonable men, could expect more in the second session of a Parliament than that which they had been offered that afternoon. A good many of them felt so strongly about old-age pensions that in order to secure them they would be prepared to assist the Government in resisting every fanciful scheme which might come into hon. Members' heads and which they thought might make the people better. There was no piece of social amelioration which had so solid a backing, not only by the working classes but by tradesmen and others who had realised that there was no more pressing need than old-age pensions, and they would support the Government in pressing forward this scheme. If, however, the Government embarked upon artificial methods of keeping the people unemployed in farm colonies which would cost huge sums of money, they would raise a feeling in the country against them, whereas they could carry the opinion of the country with them by putting their finance on sound lines which, while meeting the requirements of the country as a whole, would enable them to carry out great schemes of social reform. He had only one further word to say as one who endorsed the principles — he did not say every word he wrote—of Henry George in respect of land; and it was, that that great uncreated monopoly had never yet yielded to the community what it ought to have done.

*MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he had ventured last year to call attention to the most overtaxed members of the community, namely, professional men such as clergymen, doctors, and lawyers, with, say, an income of only £300 a year and upwards, and he said that these men were bearing an undue proportion of taxation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had met the claims of these men to a considerable extent, and for that concession he was grateful, because the right hon. Gentleman proposed (rather illogically he thought as to the limit selected) to reduce the income-tax on earned incomes below £2,000 from 1s. to 9d. For that, as he had said, he was grateful, but if it was not ungrateful to look a gift horse in the mouth he might venture to criticise the limitation of the concession; he certainly must say it was not logical, but probably it would be ungracious to make a comment upon that, because those whom he wished to assist did not possess incomes which rose to £2,000 a year. There were two small points which he mentioned last year, referring to people with whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not dealt. Assuming that a man was earning from £500 to £700 a year, if he were a bachelor he paid on that sum subject to the deduction allowed in such cases, but a married couple for some extraordinary reason were treated as one person and he thought they ought to be treated as two people. If the wife had £200 a year and the husband £600 a year, making a total of £800, they both ought not to lose the exemption, but such was the case at the present time. The other matter was the case of a man who was trading in the Colonies but living in England. If he traded in South Africa, he had to pay income tax there and also in England, therefore paying it twice. It seemed somewhat hard that those Colonials who lived in the Mother Country and those Englishmen who traded in the Colonies should be penalised in this manner. Passing from these smaller points of criticism, he protested against one important proposal which was a great departure both from the principles of sound finance and from the policy of the right hon. Gentleman's predecessors. He alluded to the suggestion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to deal with the 1s. income-tax as a permanent integral part of national finance and taxation. The right hon. Gentleman had intimated that the income-tax of 1s. on all incomes over £2,000 a year should remain as a permanent tax. That was not only a departure from the policy of his predecessors, but, in his judgment, it was unsound finance. To keep such a tax would be disastrous, as undoubtedly it was a heavy clog on commercial enterprise and business in this country. There were countries which had not got an income-tax, and to have an income-tax at that high rate in this country would undoubtedly act as a clog on our industries and might tempt manufacturers to move their businesses to other countries. Such a policy would, moreover, allow of no elasticity in case of war or other emergency. He would like to know what Mr. Gladstone would have said to a permanent income-tax, because they were all familiar with the remarks he made even on an income-tax at 6d.; but with a permanent income-tax of 1s. it was difficult to see where in case of war the reserve of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be, and where he would get his money from. One other point he wanted to criticise had regard to the capacity of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to the stability of his views. The right hon. Gentleman had said to-day that he did not propose a reduction of the tax on tea because he was satisfied that to reduce it by a 1d. a pound would not make any difference to the consumer. He did not propose for the moment to discuss the accuracy or inaccuracy of that view. Last year when the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget reduced the tea duty by a 1d. he was challenged from both sides of the House on that very point, and on the 29th of May last, sometime after the introduction of the Budget, he made a speech to the effect that he had made most careful inquiries and the net result was diametrically opposed to what he had told them to-day to be his undoubted opinion. The right hon. Gentleman said according to *Hansard*—

> "That the question which he asked his advisers at the Treasury, and which he anxiously considered before making this proposal was whether a reduction of 1d., which was without precedent, would really reach the consumer. No Chancellor of the Exchequer would wish to put money into the pockets of the trade; what he desired was to secure that the benefit of the remission should go to the person by whom the article was consumed. He made inquiries whether or not the effect of the remission of 1d. would reach the consumer, and he was assured by all the information he could gather that in an article like tea, where a duty of 6d. represented something like 100 per cent. on the actual value of the imported raw material, a reduction of 1d., or 15 per cent., where there were no intermediate processes of manipulation, in the course of which the reduction might be either delayed, intercepted, or neutralised, must speedily reach the consumer.

What had happened? The hon. Member had quoted from information that had been given to him that the reduction had gone into the pockets of the blenders. He would like to read a few words from *The Times Commercial Supplement*, which all must agree was a most admirable and very impartial summary of what went on in the commercial world. On

21st May, under the heading of 'Tea,' *The Times Commercial Supplement* dealt with this matter."

Then followed a quotation of half a column of matter proving that the penny had gone into the pocket of the consumer, which he need not read, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer added—

> "According to this authority, which was not prejudiced in favour of the Government, the effect of the reduction had already been felt and the consumer was receiving it in a reduced price of 2d., or he was paying 10d. now for what he formerly paid 1s."

If last year the 1d. reduction had really saved the consumer 2d., he would like to know from the right hon. Gentleman why this year it should be regarded as axiomatic that the reduction of a further 1d. would not reach the consumer at all. There was one point upon which he wished to give his most unfeigned support to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was afraid he was one of those who had taken the view that the national credit had been in jeopardy during the last year not only in consequence of extravagance in the way of money, but also in the way of speech. It was therefore with unfeigned gratification that he recognised that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had set aside a considerable sum for the reduction of the National Debt, and he believed he only expressed the views of most business men when he said that this money so spent would tend to reinstate the financial credit and security of the country, and probably would be repaid in the way of increased investments being made in this country.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said the Labour Party sympathised with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his attempt to reconstruct the machinery of taxation, and on the whole they welcomed the announcement that he intended to readjust the relations between central and local finance. But the great fault of his speech was the very sparse reference to all practical proposals dealing with social reform. The Labour Party were profoundly disappointed with his attitude to the old-age pension question. They saw no reason why the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not find a sufficient sum of money to start the scheme this year. It was profoundly unsatisfactory that year after year these sympathetic speeches should be made. They were perfectly prepared to admit that the Chancellor of the Echequer had gone further than any other statesman who had spoken on the question, but the gulf still fixed between promise and performance was too large not to be disquieting. They were told the scheme would start next year, but they did not know what the state of the finances would be in a year's time. The Labour Party had no objection to the reduction of the income-tax, but in the minds of some of the Members of that Party it appeared as though the Chancellor of the Exchequer had felt that he could not reduce the income-tax and give old-age pensions at the same time. The right hon. Gentleman did not put it in that way, but some of the Labour Members felt that he had passed through that mental process. There was nobody more sympathetic than he with the oppressed shopkeeper with a small and precarious income, or with the oppressed professional man, whose income, though not exactly small, was precarious and whose cost of living had perforce to be high. But while sympathetic with these people and fully recognising their claims, yet if those claims were to defer an old-age pensions scheme, then they were not in favour of the reduction of income-tax, but they were in favour of old-age pensions. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer had reduced the income-tax because he felt that he could not give them old-age pensions, then they regretted exceedingly that he had not selected an old-age pension scheme rather than the reduction of the income-tax. Moreover, on the merits of the reduction they were not quite satisfied. They thought £2,000 was far too large a limit, and they rather regarded the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman as one to relieve middle class taxation. The middle classes were the beneficiaries under his Budget scheme. They submitted that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted an income for old-age pensions or social reforms, it would have been perfectly sufficient for him to have fixed the differentiation, not at £2,000, but at £1,200 or £1,500 at the very outside. So far as the readjustment of taxation was concerned, they were on the whole in agreement with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They stood as he did for free trade. They believed that under free trade the system of taxation was much more equitable than taxation under a system of protection. Under free trade they taxed the people who could bear the tax; under protection they taxed the people who could not bear the tax. Under free trade taxation was upon a scientific basis, which consisted in this, that they had got to put their finger upon earned income and tax that lightly. The great problem which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to face, which he had partially solved, though not completely, was this problem of differentiating between income that came from social sources and income that came from individualistic sources. In this respect, they regretted that he had not gone further than he had done. As a matter of fact, unearned incomes which flowed from social sources ought never to find their way into private pockets at all. The community were the authors of these values, which went to make personal incomes and which ought to be the subject of a series of carefully constructed taxes so that the State could get for itself the whole of those unearned incomes. A shilling upon unearned incomes over £2,000 was too little. He suggested to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he should increase it to 1s. 6d. as a beginning. In that way he would earn still more the gratitude of the democratically-minded sections of the community. Another point on which they felt was this: if the weight of the taxes of a direct character was to be lightened, then it ought to have been done at the same time as indirect taxes were lightened. If the choice was to be between direct and indirect taxation for the purpose of lightening it, then he thought that the choice ought to have been in favour of indirect taxation. It was not a question of 4d. instead of 5d. on tea. That would not be an appreciable boon to the working classes. But take sugar. This was used at the breakfast table, and unless they took the whole of the duty off it would have no appreciable effect on prices for working class consumers. But sugar was a raw material, and if they took the tax off sugar to the extent of one-third, it would have an appreciable effect in stimulating industries which depended on sugar as a raw material. So that it was not merely a question of the working classes, but it was also a question of healthy production; and it would have been much sounder, from the point of view of economics, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had told the income tax-payers that he could not relieve them this year; that he had got the funds for old-age pensions, such social reforms as the medical inspection of school children, and was going to use them at once. The right hon. Gentleman might have also said, "As a matter of fact, I have got to find a larger income, and I propose to put a heavier tax on large incomes; I cannot relieve the taxpayer this year, but in order to stimulate the industry of this country I am going to take one-third or one-half off the taxation on sugar." If the right hon. Gentleman had constructed his Budget on those lines it would have been more acceptable to the democratic and Liberal opinion which gave him such a magnificent majority at the last election. When the Finance Bill was before the House the Labour Party would have to produce an Amendment which would raise the whole question of old-age pensions.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he felt thankful to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not only for the clear way in which he had brought forward his Budget, but also for his determination that Debt should be paid off, especially when there were still £139,000,000 of the war debt remaining. He could quite understand that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in bringing in his Budget could not hope to please everybody, but he hoped that when they had got rid of the war debt there would be a serious attempt to reduce taxation. He trusted that they would see every economy practised in the spending of public money. Though the working classes did not directly get anything out of this Budget, yet they did get some benefit from the public money which was spent on education. He did not think that they ought to have the sugar tax at all, because it made living more expensive, especially for the industrial classes, while it adversely affected certain industries of the country. It was a double mischief, and the sooner the Government could see their way to get rid of it altogether the better it would be. Of course, he saw the difficulty of reducing the taxes, and was aware that after it was frequently a long time before the consumer got the full benefit of a reduction. The Chancellor of the Exchequer last year mentioned in his speech that in connection with new telegraph lines two-thirds of the annual cost would be guaranteed by the Government. There were exceptional distances in Sutherlandshire, but there had been a refusal to take any share of the guarantee. He would like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer why he had not carried out the promise he made last year. If there was a case entitled to the full benefit of the Chancellor's promise it was that of Sutherland. As to the income-tax, he agreed with his hon. friend that it would have been much better if the margin had been fixed at £1,200 or £1,500 instead of £2,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might have a further opportunity of considering that matter and of doing what he could to make the rich pay their due share of the taxation of the country. As representing the country, it was their duty to make those pay who were best able to bear the burden. The taxation of the country was at the present time very excessive, and the Budget of to-day provided for an expenditure of nearly £40,000,000 more than was required ten years ago. Heavy taxation interfered seriously with trade. Some members of the Labour Party said that heavy taxation did not matter so much, because the rich would have to pay it, but he did not agree with that argument. Taxes had to be paid out of profits, which were largely made by the exertions of the working classes. If an employer had to pay such a large portion of his profits away in taxation he had no margin left to increase the wages of those who worked for him. Taxation, therefore, did affect all classes of the community.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) called attention to the absence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and complained that no reply had been made to the speech of the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) stated that it had been agreed across the Table that the formal Resolutions should be taken to-night, and the principal debate on Monday. Under the agreement between the two sides, two or three Resolutions involving contentious matter would be held back.

MR. EVELYN CECIL said he was not aware of that arrangement, but in view of what the hon. Gentleman had said he would defer any further remarks until Monday.

MR. MORTON protested against arrangements of this kind being made across the Table. He did not see why the debate should not be continued. He did not object to the Chancellor of the Exchequer taking a rest, but he had left behind a very able Gentleman who could reply for the Government. He regretted the bargain which had been made between the two front benches, because such arrangements always placed them between the devil and the deep blue sea.

Question put, and agreed to.

CONTINUANCE OF ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS DUTIES ON TOBACCO, BEER, AND SPIRITS.

2. Resolved, That the additional Customs duties on tobacco, beer, and spirits imposed by sections two, three, four, and five of The Finance Act, 1900 (including any increased duties imposed by section five of that Act), shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

CONTINUANCE OF ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTIES ON BEER AND SPIRITS.

3. Resolved, That the additional Excise duties on beer and spirits imposed by sections six and seven of The Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

HIRE PURCHASE AGREEMENT.

4. Resolved, That a hire purchase agreement shall be charged with stamp duty as an agreement, or if under seal or in Scotland with a clause of registration as a deed, as the case requires, and shall not in any case be exempt from stamp duty as an agreement, letter, or memorandum made for or relating to the sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ESTATE DUTY (FINANCE ACT, 1896, s. 21).

5. Resolved, That the deduction allowed under section twenty-one of The Finance Act, 1896, on account of the previous payment of duty on property shall (instead of being calculated as provided by that section) be taken to be the amount which would be payable on account of the duty on the property if the duty were calculated on the value of the property upon which estate duty is payable.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

PERMANENT ANNUAL CHARGE.

6. Resolved, That the permanent annual charge for the National Debt for the current financial year be twenty-nine and a-half million pounds.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

AMENDMENT OF LAW.

7. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at Five minutes before Ten o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 19*th April*, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.—As amended, considered. An Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Ammanford; Burry Port; and, Pentremawr; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From East Lothian; Falkirk; and, Peebleshire; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Greenock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Argyll; Falkirk; Forres; Haddington; Kirkintillock; and, Paisley; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Abbeyhill; Alexandria; Ayr; Ballachulish; Cambuslang; Clydebank (four); Colmonell; Dundee; Edinburgh (six); Glasgow; Greenock; Helensburgh; Johnstone; Kirkcudbright; Longside; Milnathort; Nairn; New Leeds; Savoch; and Tarbert; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from Raunds, in favour; to lie upon Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Licence granted to Thomas Thompson under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853 to 1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A of The Penal Servitude Act, 1864 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLICE ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's Certificate under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force for the year ended 29th September, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th April; Mr. Runciman]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Preparation of Parliamentary Returns by Customs Statistical Office.

Major COATES (Lewisham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what class of clerks prepare and check the Parliamentary Returns required from the Statistical Office of the Customs.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I learn that Parliamentary Returns required from the

Statistical Office are prepared by assistant clerks, allowanced assistant clerks, and by the staff generally, and as far as necessary are checked by allowanced assistant clerks, minor staff officers, junior clerks, and senior clerks. Such Returns are also finally scrutinised by senior clerks before being submitted to the deputy principal and principal.

Salaries of Staff of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury why it is that the salaries paid to the staff of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries are on a lower scale than those paid in other departments of the State similarly constituted, *e.g.*, the Local Government Board and the Board of Trade, and whether his attention has been called to the fact that since the creation of the Department in 1889 many fresh duties have been imposed upon it.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The staff and salaries of different departments are settled on the basis of the requirements of each department. I do not consider it possible to compare the work of departments differing so widely in functions as those named. All departments are of course liable to have their duties added to by legislation.

Valuation of Newport (Mon.) Public Houses—Decision of Inland Revenue.

MR. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that on the 4th day of August, 1906, valuations of four licensed public houses in the borough of Newport (Mon.) were remitted to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue for determination, and that up to the present time no decision has been obtained from the Commissioners, thus causing delay there in carrying out the provisions of The Licensing Act, 1904, and increasing the difficulty experienced by the justices in estimating the amount available for compensation purposes; and whether he will take such steps as may be necessary to expedite the decision of the Commissioners in this and like cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The computation of compensation under the Licensing Act, 1904, in accordance with the principles laid down by the court, requires the collection of a great deal of detailed information, and this has made it impossible for the Board of Inland Revenue to proceed otherwise than slowly with the large number of cases referred to them in the year 1906. The cases referred from the borough of Newport (Mon.) have, however, now been dealt with, and the determinations of the Commissioners have been communicated to the compensation authority.

Alleged Dissatisfaction amongst Irish National School Inspectors.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction amongst inspectors of national schools in Ireland, because they are constantly harassed by letters from the Education Office, to which many of them had to write strongly in reply, while others had to travel long distances from the country to Dublin to remonstrate in person against such treatment, and some are afraid to give expression to their feelings on the matter for fear of penalties involved; whether these letters are the productions of clerks and others utterly ignorant of inspection work; whether any of the twenty Commissioners, except Dr. Starkie, can be sufficiently intimate with the working of the Education Office to know anything about the justice of any fine or censure imposed; and whether, seeing complaints or protests only lead to further punishment which, owing to the ignorance of the inner working of the office on the part of nearly all the Commissioners, can be inflicted with impunity, he will appoint a small committee to inquire into the working of the National Education Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they are not aware that dissatisfaction exists amongst their inspectors generally. Certain inspectors have been guilty of irregularities and have performed their duties in an unsatisfactory manner, and have consequently incurred official censure. This censure was not imposed until the cases had been very fully investigated by the chief or senior inspectors and the facts placed before the resident Commissioner or the Board. Two of the inspectors concerned were summoned before a special committee meeting of the Commissioners, and were afforded full opportunity of answering the charges brought against them. The Commissioners individually are kept fully informed of all the business of the office, and no serious punishment is inflicted on any officers without their authority. The maintenance of discipline among the staff is a matter which falls within the province of the Commissioners themselves, and facts have been brought to my notice which would appear to call for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the matter.

Jamaica Banana Trade Subsidy.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the subsidy of £40,000 per annum paid by Great Britain and Jamaica, by securing to the banana growers the advantage of competition of British markets, has absolutely failed, through the subsidised company combining with the United Fruit Company of America; and whether, seeing that, instead of developing Jamaica bananas, they have increased the importation of the Costa Rica bananas, planted and grown specially since the subsidy was granted, he can state what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State is not prepared to admit that the subsidy referred to has failed in its main object of assisting the development of the Jamaica banana trade. It is not proposed to take any action in the matter.

Herrings in the Clyde Districts.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will lay upon the Table a statement showing the number of hundredweights of herrings landed in the Clyde districts collectively, and in Campbeltown, Inverary, Rothesay, Greenock, and Ballantrae severally, during the year 1906, in continuation of the statement furnished by him on March 15th, 1906.

(*Answered by Mr Sinclair.*) The information desired by my hon. friend is as follows:—

	Cwts.
District of Campbeltown	38,745
District of Inverary	18,403
District of Rothesay	47,982
District of Greenock	27,511
District of Ballantrae	54,947
Total	187,588

Workhouse Dietary—Saving of Bread.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the Report of the workhouse master to the Dover Board of Guardians, dated the 12th instant, to the effect that he had saved thirteen tons of bread, value £133, on the dietary scale, and that this had been achieved by the adoption of the principle of allowing inmates to have what bread they required, instead of serving out the regulation quantity, which had hitherto resulted in waste; and whether, in view of the saving thus gained, at no loss to the inmates of the workhouse, he will direct the attention of all local authorities to the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Dietaries Order issued by the Local Government Board in October, 1900, contains a regulation enabling the guardians of every Poor Law union to direct, in respect of any class of inmates of the workhouse, that a definite portion of the prescribed allowance of bread shall be served in the first instance to each inmate. Any inmate, however, may demand the full allowance to which he is entitled, and the total allowance for each class must in all cases be sent into the dining-room. I understand that the course adopted at Dover is in accordance with this regulation. The matter was brought under the notice of all boards of guardians in the circular which accompanied the Order, and I believe that much advantage has resulted; but I will instruct the inspectors to draw the attention of the guardians to the regulation in any cases where this may be necessary.

Discoveries of Hidden Cartridges.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the recent discoveries of hidden cartridges have already, this month, amounted to 184,000, as follows: In Newcastle on 9th April, 31,000, Newcastle on 10th April, 100,000, Sunderland on 3rd April, 35,000, Glasgow on 12th April, 15,000, and Edinburgh on 15th April 3,000; and, if so, whether he can throw any further light on the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The number of cartridges seized at Newcastle on the 10th instant was 85,000; otherwise I believe the figures given by the hon. Member are substantially correct. I received reports from the Chief Constables of Newcastle and Sutherland, stating that in both places the matter was under investigation in the police courts. Since then I have learnt that the defendant at Sunderland has been convicted and fined £20 for unlawful storage of explosives, and that the magistrates have directed the forfeiture of the explosives. The question of prosecutions at Glasgow and Edinburgh is, I am informed, receiving the attention of the Lord Advocate.

Irish Tax Revenue.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.); To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what was the amount of the tax revenue contributed by Ireland in the financial year 1801–2.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) £2,521,219.

Account of Mr. Clementi's Tour.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether any record exists in the India Office, or is available elsewhere, of a journey recently made by Mr. Clementi, of the Hong Kong Civil Service, across South China and Yunnan to Burma; and, if so, whether he will place such record in the Library.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As Mr. Clementi is an officer in the Colonial Service I will reply to this Question. It is understood that Mr. Clementi is preparing an account of his recent tour, but it is impossible to say whether or not it will be published.

Sale of the Whyte Estate, County Leitrim.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are proceeding with the arrangements for the sale of the Whyte estate, Newtownmanor, county Leitrim; and, if so, what steps are being taken, an order for sale under Section 40 of The Land Act, 1903, having been made some months ago.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Judge has made an order for the sale of this estate, and the Estates Commissioners have lodged a request, under Section 7 of the Act of 1903, for particulars of the estate with a view to considering the question of purchase. I am informed that the title of the estate is very long and complicated, and as a result the Land Judge's Court will not be in a position to comply with the Estates Commissioners' request for several months to come.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Patrick Woods.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Patrick Woods, Anskert, Annaghmore, on the Allen estate, in county Leitrim; and, if so, will an inspector investigate the same.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have recently received the application referred to, and will have the case investigated by an inspector in due course.

Irish Emigration Returns.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what proportion of the emigrants from Ireland since 1841 came from each of the four provinces, and what proportion the total in each province bears to the average population in that province during the period.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) During the period from 1st May, 1851, to 31st December, 1906, the proportion of emigrants from Ireland according to provinces was : Leinster, 17·4 per cent. ; Munster, 35·1 per cent. ; Ulster, 28·2 per cent. ; Connaught, 16·6 per cent. ; province not specified, 2·7 per cent. In the same period the ratio of emigrants to every 100 of the average population was : Leinster, 52·5 ; Munster, 102·4 ; Ulster, 64·1 ; Connaught, 81·6. Emigration Returns were not prepared prior to 1851.

Irish Agricultural Department Grants.

MR. J. MACVEAGH : To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the £1,198,502 stated to be voted by Parliament to the Department of Agriculture during the past seven years includes the endowment fund, and what the amount of the endowment was.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The sum of £1,198,502 referred to in the Question includes, in addition to £185,000 paid over to the Congested Districts Board, a sum of £126,000 (that is, £18,000 a year for the past seven years), which was provided by Parliament under Section 15, Sub-sections (d) and (f), of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Act of 1899. The last-mentioned sum, though provided in the Parliamentary Vote, forms portion of the endowment fund established under that section of the Act. The amount received into the endowment fund in the past seven years, excluding the sum provided in the Vote, was as follows :—

	£
Capital received under Section 15, Sub-sections (c), (e) (g)	224,644
Annual statutory receipts under Section 15, Sub-sections (a) and (b) - - - -	1,036,000
Received under the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Act, 1902 - - -	25,000
Received from the Ireland Development Grant for Technical Instruction - -	17,500
Received from the Congested Districts Board - -	6,000
	£1,309,144

Teaching of Roman Catholic Children in Irish Protestant Schools.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) : To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether His Majesty's Government will take immediate steps to alter the position created under the rules of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland by which teachers of the Roman Catholic faith may be appointed to teach Roman Catholic children in a minority in a school the majority of children attending which are Protestants, whilst Protestant teachers are not permitted to be appointed to teach Protestant children in a minority in a school the majority of children attending which are Roman Catholics.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that the rule referred to will have the effect mentioned in the Question. I have already explained that the object of the rule was to remove obstacles to the combined education of Protestants of different denominations, and I have stated on the authority of the Commissioners that the rule is not to be applied in schools under Protestant management in which there is a minority of Roman Catholic pupils.

Lough Cutra National Schools—Religious Instruction.

MR. SLOAN : To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Protestant children attending Lough Cutra national school, county Galway, are compelled to be present at the opening of the school to answer the roll call, after which they are turned out in all kinds of weather until religious instruction is given to Roman Catholic scholars ; and whether seeing that the parents of these Protestant children have asked leave to send their children to this school after religious instruction has been given, he will make inquiries into the matter, with a view to granting their request.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Lough Cutra boys' and girls' national schools are on the estate of Viscount Gough, who is patron, the manager being Mr. F. F. Persse. The Commissioners of National Education have no information that the fact is as stated in the Question. There are five Protestant pupils on the rolls of the boys' school, and four Protestant pupils on the rolls of the girls' school, and there is no reason why any of these pupils should be present before 10.20 each morning, when the religious instruction has finished.

Typhus Outbreak at Oughterard.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the resolution of the Oughterard Rural District Council, passed on the 11th inst., in which it is stated that the outbreak of typhus in the district was due to famine conditions rather than to the insanitary condition of the houses where the outbreak originated, as reported by the Local Government Board medical inspector; and whether he will institute adequate relief works to cope with the distress that prevails in the Oughterard union.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) According to the resolution referred to, the district council appear to consider that the fever is not due to the insanitary conditions described by the Local Government Board's inspectors, inasmuch as the same conditions have always prevailed in Oughterard. The Board, however, are satisfied that the contention of the council has no support. The state of things found by the inspector constitutes a perpetual menace to public health, and if district councils were to be absolved from all responsibility in cases in which insanitary conditions have existed for a long time there would be an end of sanitary reform in Ireland. The Local Government Board are entirely satisfied that there is no foundation for the suggestion that famine prevails in this union and has caused the outbreak of fever. The guardians are bound by law to keep their relieving officers in funds for the relief of all urgent cases. They are well aware of their statutory obligations and powers, and the Board cannot consider that they would be so oblivious of their duty to the destitute poor as to allow them to suffer from want of food to an extent which would cause famine fever. The Local Government Board have afforded through the spring months, and are still affording, employment to many hundreds of families in the poorest parts of this union where distress was apprehended, and the rates have thereby been relieved of a considerable burden. The Board are satisfied that the resources of the union will be ample to enable the guardians to provide any further relief that may be necessary.

The Hague Conference and Aerial Navigation.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the expiration of the five years' term for which the launching of explosives from air ships was by agreement of the Powers prohibited, and the possible absence of present unanimity and difficulty of enforcement of any new agreement, he can give the House general information as to any decision of the Defence Committee upon the subject; whether defensive airship experiment and construction is treated as the exclusive concern of the Army, or how far the Admiralty is being consulted with regard to it.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) As the question of the renewal of this agreement will doubtless be considered at the coming Conference at the Hague, I think it better to say nothing on the subject of renewal at the present moment. The Naval and Military Departments are watching such progress as has been made with aerial navigation, but experimental work, so far, has been confined to the War Office.

MEN EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT ORDNANCE FACTORIES AND AT WOOLWICH ARSENAL.

In the printed Answer to the Questions by Mr. Barnes and Mr. Rowlands of Wednesday last (appearing on page 970) the figures given for 1895–6 for Royal Small Arms Factory, Birmingham, should be 568 (instead of 883), and for Royal Gunpowder Factory, Waltham, 883 (instead of 568).

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Sir Walter Richard Nugent, baronet, for the county of Westmeath, South Westmeath Division.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Cochrane; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Akers-Douglas.

Report to lie upon the Table.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.), in moving that this Bill be read a second time, said he only desired as an Irish farmer who knew something about land to say it was no use to pass a Land Purchase Bill unless compulsion was put into it, because the landlords and agents in Ireland would always study how to get round it. He begged to move.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.), in seconding the Motion, said the object of the measure had been very briefly indicated by his hon. friend, and perhaps it would be regarded as desirable that, at the beginning of the debate, a somewhat more detailed explanation should be given on behalf of those who were responsible for its provisions. He believed that the Bill was the natural and inevitable consequence of existing legislation and of the experience of the last few years. Let them take the question of land purchase with which the Bill was for the most part concerned. Whatever anyone might think or might have thought of the policy of land purchase, it was several years now since most people came to the conclusion that in that direction alone, so far as Ireland was concerned, might be found the solution of one of the most difficult and thorny problems which had ever engaged the attention of any Legislature in modern times. For one reason alone it was now useless to think of any other solution whatever. Too many occupiers of land in Ireland had already become the owners of their own holdings for anyone to think it possible that the process of purchase should cease till the whole body of ordinary occupiers had been turned into proprietors. But at least two vital facts had been brought into special prominence since the passing of the Irish Land Act of 1903, which showed that, without further legislation, the end which practically all persons now admitted to be inevitable could not in some cases be attained at all, and, in other cases, could be attained only at a risk which Ireland could not afford to run. One of those facts was that the price of land sold under the Land Purchase Acts had gone up in a very extraordinary way without any corresponding increase in the value of the land having taken place. He should not weary the House by going into statistics. It was enough to say what was universally admitted—that the price had gone up since 1903 by at least five or six years purchase of the rent, while at the very same time the price of agricultural commodities had either gone down or remained stationary. No one could deny that that was a very serious matter for Ireland, and he said for Ireland advisedly, because it was Ireland which would suffer if the price turned out to be one which could not be paid by the Irish tenant purchasers. Even within the last few days Answers to certain Questions which had been put to the Secretary for Ireland had brought this fact unpleasantly home to Irish Members and their constituents. They had got in this matter the aid of Imperial credit—no small thing, but the late Government and its Unionist predecessor in 1891 took right good care to surround the lending authority with a triple safeguard against loss. Before the Imperial Treasury could lose a penny by land purchase in Ireland, the land bought, the Imperial grants to Ireland, and the local rates in Ireland, those paid by persons who were not farmers as well as those paid by people who were, must first be exhausted. It was, therefore, a very serious matter for all classes of people in Ireland that the prices paid for Irish land should have risen as they had done, without any known cause beyond that furnished by the conditions on which the purchase money, as the law now stood, was advanced. He confessed he was himself one of those who did not see much or any harm in the establishment of zones within which money must be advanced without the delay caused by inspection. He thought that it would hasten sales, and that it would not lead to the enhancement of prices. But he had come to the conclusion, like most others, that the mere pointing at prices which might be asked and paid, and the dispensing with any inquiry as to whether proper security was taken for the money advanced, had directly and unmistakably tended to inflate artificially the price of the landlords' property, and, accordingly, the first proposal they made in this Bill was to abolish the zones and to revert to the practice, in the case of sales by agreement, of requiring the Land Commission not to advance any money unless they were satisfied that the agreed price was equitable to tenants as well as to owners, and that the repayment of it was amply secured. That was the first proposal in this Bill, and it was one in which Ireland as a whole was interested, though he imagined that the Treasury might well conclude that it was one in which they were interested also. Ireland, as a whole, would have to pay, and Ireland, therefore, must take care, as far as it could, that it did not run too great a risk. The other vital fact to which he had referred as having been brought into special prominence in recent years was that many landlords would not sell at all, no matter what inducements they might receive. This, again, was a very serious matter from more points of view than one. From the point of view of social order it was extremely dangerous to have on one side of the hedge or wall a body of tenant occupiers still groaning under excessive rents, assessed partly on their own improvements, and still in some fear of agents and bailiffs; while on the other side was to be found a contented, if not a very thriving, body of occupying owners. The co-existence of two such bodies would necessarily produce intolerable results. Moreover, one of the duties cast upon the Estates Commissioners appointed under the Act of 1903 was to redistribute the grazing ranches, from which the people were evicted wholesale in the time of the dreadful clearances of the last century, amongst the thousands of tenants now eking out in some mysterious way a miserable existence on patches of land too diminutive to afford them a decent subsistence. But this duty, which was not only cast on the Estates Commissioners, but was one of the principal duties of the Congested Districts Board, could never be performed effectively by either body under the law as it stood, or as long as certain owners of land refused to facilitate its performance; and yet it was absolutely safe to say that till the land to which he referred was opened up to the landless people the Irish land question would remain unsolved. It was really very amusing to hear the right hon. Member for Dover, when dealing with the Land Bill of 1903, repeatedly make statements to the effect that there was "not land enough to go round" amongst the various classes of the agricultural population of Ireland who were without any land, or possessed only too small a portion and asked for some land or for a larger portion than they had. Certainly there would not be enough for all the claimants if a comparatively few graziers, many of whom were not even tenants at will, were allowed to monopolise thousands of acres apiece. But there would be land enough and to spare for those who had none or too little, if those big grazing ranches were made available for division, and it was absolute nonsense to say the reverse. But there was another consideration which must be taken into account. It was surely time to put an end to the reign of the Clanricardes of the country. There were more of them than one. He need not describe them. They were a standing menace to social order; their action as landlords was a perpetual invitation to social strife; from various motives into which he would not enter, they would neither act with consideration or even justice towards their tenants, nor take a fair price for their interest in their estates and go away with the money. Was it expedient that they should be allowed to remain as landlords? It was quite evident that the answer to that question must be in the negative. For these reasons they had come to the conclusion that compulsory sale and compulsory purchase must at last be resorted to; and, accordingly, they proposed to give the Estates Commissioners power, where no agreement could be arrived at, and where either the landlord or three-fourths of the tenants put them in motion, to compel the landlord to sell either to themselves or to the tenants, and to compel the tenants to buy at a price to be fixed by the Commissioners, after having heard the views of all the parties interested, including the tenants, and after having made it certain that the sum advanced was properly secured.

That was as regarded the sale of tenanted estates. As to the sale and purchase of parcels of land for re-distribution amongst the landless people, they proposed to empower the Estates Commissioners, if they could not acquire much land by agreement, to acquire it by compulsion. But the sort of land in regard to which they proposed to give this power was strictly defined, because they did not want to bear hardly on any large tenant of land who was doing useful service not only to himself, but to the community, by, for instance. the employment of labour. They did not aim at any large farm on which a rent could be fixed, which, though it was one on which the tenant did not reside, was worked by him in conjunction with the holding on which he did reside. They aimed chiefly at those large grazing ranches, a great proportion of which were not tenanted land at all in the technical sense of the term, because they were let out for only eleven months of the year, and the rest of which, though tenanted, were held on an uncertain tenure, and were, therefore, holdings in which the tenants of them had no real interest, and had, as a rule, enough of land without them. They proposed that all such lands as were necessary for the purpose of relieving congestion, for enlarging uneconomic holdings, and for providing land for people who were now without any, should be purchased, by agreement if possible, by compulsion if agreement was unattainable. In regard to purchases of this kind also, they proposed that the Estates Commissoners should have due regard to the owners, and other persons interested in the land, and to the security for the money advanced. Those same powers, he must add, they proposed to give to the Congested Districts Board, by whom, he believed, they were desired, and who at present were hampered on all sides in the performance of the most important work now going on in Ireland, by the want of such powers. He did not think that they were called upon at this time of day to defend the principle of compulsion as applied to land. Since the year 1845 that principle had been embedded in their legislation. Every session power was given to local authorities to acquire compulsorily land at a price fixed by an authority independent of owners and purchasers. In Irish land legislation it had been resorted to again and again. Before the Act of 1893, if there were, say, an owner in fee, a leaseholder with a term of 1,000 years, another leaseholder of 200 years, and another with a sixty years term at the time of sale, the lowest down in the scale of owners was the selling owner, as he was still, for the purpose of sale under the Land Purchase Acts, and, once he made an agreement with the occupying tenants, every owner above him was compulsorily bought out at a price fixed by the constituted tribunal. The Act of 1893 went a step further and provided that, if there were owners between the sixty-year man and the occupying tenants, they also were to be compulsorily redeemed in the same way. The question in all cases was whether there was a public necessity for the application of the compulsory principle, and what they said on that subject was that such a necessity had never existed if it did not exist in the cases now under consideration. When there were thousands and tens of thousands of people without any land at all; when tens of thousands of others were living on patches of land wholly insufficient for their support in decent comfort; when, in consequence of those two facts, there was still a deadly drain of emigration of the very flower of the population, the time in their opinion was past for peddling measures, or for academic discussions on the abstract merits or demerits of the principle of compulsion, or for waiting, like Micawber, for "something to turn up." Ireland could not afford to wait; that was the short and the long of it. At present, a railway company would be empowered to purchase by compulsion the choicest spots of land in England, if it proved that it was for the public advantage that a railway should run through it. Was it of any importance to save a whole people? He would not argue the matter of compulsion further, especially in a House of Commons which was predominantly Liberal, and for the reason that the Liberal Party was pledged to the application of the compulsory principle to Irish land. In 1901 and 1902 the question was specifically raised, and on both those occasions the Leaders of the Liberal Party as well as their followers, speaking of them as a body, voted in favour of compulsion. Amongst them he might mention the present Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for War, the Home Secretary, and several others in the front rank of the Party. He could not suppose that they would now recede from the position they adopted five and six years ago. This Bill contained several other proposals dealing with land purchase, but he should notice only two or three of the more important. A good deal had been heard in recent years of the grievances of town tenants in Ireland. Something was done last year to remove those grievances. Clause 13 of this Bill was intended to supplement the Town Tenants Act in a way which would be at once effective and, he believed, entirely unobjectionable to the landlords. The Act of 1903 enabled owners in fee of an estate which was mainly agricultural to sell all non-agricultural holdings on the estate, such as houses in villages and towns, provided they were not the main part of the estate. But the Act also provided that where those non-agricultural holdings were held by middlemen under long leases the provision regarding the compulsory redemption of interests intervening between the owner in fee and the occupying tenants should not operate. It was, in his opinion, an objectless and stupid Amendment, and it had tended to prevent the sale of many small villages and towns, particularly in the West of Ireland. They sought to repeal it, and thus to allow the town tenants in those places to become their own landlords, and thus solve for ever, so far at least as they were concerned, the town tenants question. The matter of sporting rights had been the cause of much friction, bad feeling, and obstruction to the sale of estates. Landlords in many cases had insisted, when selling, on retaining those rights, while the tenants generally had objected to their doing so, on the very intelligible ground that if they did not possess those rights they would constantly be subjected to all sorts of interference in the management of their holdings. There was a very general feeling that sporting rights might be made in many parts of the country a valuable asset, but they could only be made so with the consent and goodwill of the new proprietors, and they therefore proposed that they must henceforth go with the fee simple, unless the new proprietor voluntarily gave them to the old proprietor for his life. They similarly proposed that all gravel, sand, stone and clay should go with the land purchased, except where a quarry was being actually worked by the landlord at the time of the sale, and they did so for a similar reason, namely, that as long as a landlord was allowed to retain such things, which might be absolutely necessary for the proper cultivation and management of a holding, sales would be as they had been, obstructed. The only other proposal regarding land purchase to which he would refer was that regarding the bonus. The Act of 1903 itself contained a provision under which the arrangements then made regarding the bonus might be revised towards the close of next year. It seemed to him that the time had already come for a different arrangement. The original idea in giving a bonus at all was to facilitate sales by bridging the gap between the figure at which the landlord could afford to sell and that at which the tenant could afford to buy. But the provision whereby the bonus given to the landlord rose in proportion to the price he exacted for his land had naturally had the effect of forcing prices up and thus depriving the tenants of the pecuniary advantage which was intended for them by Parliament. They accordingly reverted to the proposal of which he gave notice in 1903, that henceforward the bonus should be in inverse ratio to the price, and, to enable the Estates Commissioners to improve estates and redistribute them, if necessary for the advantage of the tenants, they made the additional proposal that the bonus should be paid only when sales were made to the Commissioners. The landlords were warned four years ago by the provision in the Act of 1903 to which he had referred that if they sought to obtain a very high price and at the same time to pocket the bonus, some such change as this would be made, and they thought it was high time now to make the bonus, before it was exhausted, what it was intended to be by Parliament. He had now gone through the principal provisions of the Bill as far as land purchase was concerned. It remained for him to say a few words regarding the proposed Amendments of the Land Law Acts. They proposed to reduce the satutory term of fifteen years to ten. It might be sufficient to say in defence of that proposal that it was one of the recommendations of the Select Committee over which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose presided some years ago. They proposed to abolish the right of the landlord to buy in at a price lower than what might be obtained in the open market a tenancy which was put up for sale. It was manifestly unjust that that right should exist. They proposed to repeal what was properly and truly called the "eviction-made-easy" section of the Act of 1887. It was their firm conviction that that provision was responsible for the great majority of the cases in which old tenancies had been broken and their owners thereby deprived of the right to get a fair rent fixed. They proposed that the presumption regarding improvements should be made universal in favour of the tenants. That provision would simply give legal effect to what was the notorious fact in ninety-nine out of every hundred cases that came before the tribunals which fixed rents. Finally, they proposed, by giving a certain class of future tenants the right to fix fair rents, to undo the most disastrous effect of hard and unjust evictions which were made possible mainly by the eviction-made-easy provision which he had just mentioned. He had now to say a few words in anticipation of some objections which might be made to the main and certainly the most far-reaching provision in the Bill, that, namely, regarding compulsory sale and purchase. It might be objected that the machinery provided for carrying out compulsory sales was not adequate. He did not admit anything of the kind. They had deliberately avoided as too cumbrous and expensive such machinery as that provided under the Land Clauses Acts. But, as a matter of fact, the principle on which that machinery was constructed—namely, that independent arbitrators should fix the price—was the very principle of the existing machinery for carrying out sales of which they availed themselves. The Estates Commissioners were a body independent in the same sense in which an arbitrator so-called was independent, and even at present they practically fixed the price, or might do so, in cases of sales outside the zones. If the compulsory principle was applied, they would do exactly the same sort of work as they were doing now in those cases, and if they wanted further assistance the Treasury might provide it. A more important objection that might be made was that such an operation as universal compulsory sale could not be financed. That was the objection taken by the late Prime Minister in 1901 when it was suggested that £120,000,000 would be required. He said that it would be political lunacy to talk of such a thing, though two years after he had become sufficient of a political lunatic as to give his consent to an Act which contemplated an advance of £112,000,000. But he ventured to say that to raise this financial objection was to raise a bogey. In the first place, under this Bill all the land of Ireland now left unsold would not be sold compulsorily. In the second place, the sale of such land as was liable to compulsory sale could not possibly be completed in a year or two years or five years, or even in a longer period. The Treasury at present interposed delays that had astonished most persons, and their resources in creating fresh causes of delay were not exhausted. Besides, the distribution of the purchase money was not, as many landlords and tenants knew, an easy matter or one shortly dealt with. Even as it was, it took years before it was completed, and not till the final order of the Land Commission on that subject was made need the advance be made by the Treasury. At the present moment, without compulsion, but with the zones in operation, which, so far as the Treasury was concerned, had much the same result, there was over £1,000,000 intended for land purchase lying in bank unused. The objection was, he repeated, a bogey. Compulsory sale and purchase, so far as it could operate under this Bill, would not be a short operation; but the difference it would make was that it would absolutely secure that every perch of land required to be sold to occupying proprietors would pass, at all events long before the present generation had passed away, into such hands. The Irish land question was not yet solved. He lamented the fact because that question blocked, more or less, the way to all other reforms on which the Irish nation was bent. They desired sincerely to solve it as soon as possible without injustice to a single landlord in Ireland; and with that desire they presented this Bill to the judgment of Parliament.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.) said he did not think that at the present time there was money ready to pay any man whose property might be taken from him. He believed in land purchase in Ireland, and he had done so since the Act of 1870 was passed. Since then it had become more and more inevitable by each of the almost annual Land Acts which had been passed. That was the only way out of the morass into which the land question in Ireland had got—the only way to terminate the dual ownership which had been working so unfortunately. He believed in the principle of compulsory purchase as a means of ending the question in all cases where it could be shown that there had been a reasonable effort to bring about voluntary purchase and the effort had failed to accomplish the desired end, and where the persons whose lands were compulsorily taken could be paid in prompt cash. But to take lands from a man who did not wish to sell and leave him to wait years for his money was essentially unjust; and, further—even in the interests of a prompt settlement—no man ought to be compelled to sell against his will until he had had a fair chance to sell at a reasonable price and the money was ready to pay him. The Bill now before the House would retard and not accelerate land purchase, involve disputes and the hearing of cases in court with attendant costs and delay, and was an attempt to break through the fundamental principle of the Act of 1903—by far the most successful of all Irish land legislation. The basis on which the Purchase Act of 1903 was passed with the assent and approval of all parties in Ireland was that in sales under the Act the price should, with the bonus percentage, be such as to secure to the landlord his present net income less the cost of collection. The Land Conference recommended that basis, and the provisions of the Act were, if fairly and properly used by landlords and tenants, well calculated to settle the Irish land question. It was regarded hopefully as a treaty of peace, and a vast number of sales were arranged under its provisions in the first two months after it came into force. Amongst other landlords who sold estates was the hon. Member for Waterford, who obtained a very satisfactory price for an estate of which he was the owner as defined by the Act. Unfortunately the treaty of peace was not fairly observed. An influential section of the Nationalist Party, backed by an important newspaper, set itself to advise the tenants of Ireland to offer prices very much lower than Land Conference terms, and ever since persistent attempts had been made to get rid of, or render unworkable, certain provisions of the Act, more particularly the zone system, by which alone it was possible for a landlord willing to sell his estate to make a definite bargain within the limits of the zones as to the amount of the purchase money he was to receive. If the zone system were done away with he believed the greatest possible blow would be dealt at the sale of land in Ireland. No man cared to offer for sale his whole estate at a price to be settled by somebody else, particularly if he had not the smallest confidence in the somebody else, and believed that he would be actuated by political pressure or other motive to offer an insufficient price. He would not particularise what those motives might be. The earlier Purchase Acts no doubt left it to the Land Commission to decide how much of the agreed price they would advance; but they dealt only with the sale of single holdings separately, and it was quite a common thing for landlords to refuse to sell any holding where the sum sanctioned was in their opinion too small. Many a tenant thereby lost a chance of buying at a price he was quite content with. The Act of 1903 dealt with the sale of whole estates, and the Estates Commission refused to deal with less than an estate; and, therefore, the landlord could not sell one holding and retain another according as the prices sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners were, or were not, satisfactory to him. It must be all or none. The zone system was of the greatest value in enabling both landlords and tenants to agree definitely on a price they considered fair, and binding the Estates Commission to advance it provided it was shown to the Land Commission that the public who were advancing the money were protected by the price being within the limits of what were called the zones—neither too high nor too low. The vast majority of landlords had been quite willing to sell on the terms of the Act. Already about one-third of the tenanted land of Ireland had come under its operation in the three-and-a-half years the Act had been in force. The sales would be even faster but for the terrible delay in getting paid, which had resulted, from the very success of the Act, in crowding the Court of the Commission, and the state of the money market, which compelled the Treasury to hold back from supplying funds. There were few, if any, landlords who would not accept the terms obtained in the case of the estate of the hon. Member for Waterford. To interfere with the zone system would, he was perfectly certain, put a serious stop on sales. It would also prevent the application of the principle of compulsory purchase in which with proper safeguards he was an entire believer. If any landlords refused to negotiate for sale on Land Conference terms when there was a prospect of reasonably prompt payment of the purchase money, he considered that in the interests of the country, the tenants, and themselves, they should be compelled to sell their tenanted lands. He thought this Bill would delay and not acclerate the application of compulsory purchase. The Bill, in addition to the abolition of the zones, contained a compulsory purchase section, but it would be unworkable. It did not deal with how the money was to be got promptly, and surely there could be no compulsion to sell unless there was money available to pay. The very fact that this block had occurred was preventing the sale of land to-day. As soon as the block was removed and there was a probability of getting a sale he had no doubt that the Estate Commissioners would be fed with applications for sale under the Land Act of 1903. The existence of encumbrances on estates in Ireland rendered it impossible for the landlord in many cases to sell, seeing he could only get a price which would yield him 3½ per cent. while he had to pay interest at the rate of 4, 5, and 6 per cent on the encumbrances. If the zones were abolished more estates would come into the market for sale to the tenants. It seemed to be rather an idle suggestion that there should be at present compulsory purchase, until it had been shown that the landlords had had a reasonable chance of carrying out a voluntary sale. At the present time there were a great many landlords who had not had an opportunity of sale by voluntary agreement owing to the enormous delay caused by the very success of the Land Act of 1903. As to untenanted land, it was proposed by the Bill that it should be purchased at a price to be fixed by the persons who were to become the purchasers. He would not object to buy land even in Ireland on those terms. It appeared to him that that amounted to pure confiscation. On many of those lands there were no tenants—[AN HON. MEMBER: That is untrue.]; on large areas there had never been any tenants; there was no question of tenants' rights or tenants' improvements. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh, oh."] On portions of them there never had been any tenants or tenants' improvements.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): That is false.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R. Barkston Ash) said that the hon. Member for King's County had twice interrupted, saying that one statement of the hon. Member for Fermanagh was untrue and that another was false. Was that in order?

*MR. SPEAKER said that it was not in order. The hon. Member might use the term that the statement was inaccurate.

*MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH said he did not desire to get into any controversy with the hon. Gentleman. What he maintained was that large parts of those untenanted lands had never been in possession of tenants. There was, therefore, no question of tenants' right or of tenants' improvements. Mr. Parnell used to say that Ireland had need of all her sons; and he had read speeches by prominent Nationalists expressing the hope that landlords who had sold to their tenants would continue to live in Ireland on their own lands. The clause in this Bill for providing for their compulsory expropriation at any price the Estates Commission might choose to offer was a curious commentary on that pious hope—a reminder how loyalists of all sorts would be treated by an Irish elective Assembly. And the Bill also proposed to expropriate tenants of non-residential holdings. He was perfectly well aware that in parts of Ireland, more particularly in the west, with which he had been all his life connected, there was pressing need of more land and better land for the people. No one regretted more than he did that economic causes had led to the growth of large grazing farms, and that legislation, such as the Land Act of 1881, had greatly increased the evil by making owners prefer keeping large grazing farms in their own hands as a source of revenue to smaller tillage holdings in the hands of tenants, which involved almost perennial litigation with regard to fixing rent, etc. Was it just that owners of grass lands, whether landlords or tenants, should be compelled to part with them for the benefit of the smaller holders? Let the Congested Districts Board be authorised and be provided with funds to enable them to offer a fair price and they would get plenty of land. He believed there were few if any western landlords who would not be delighted to reduce to a minumun their ownership of land if they could only do so without a loss of income which they could not afford to incur. He did not believe any landlord in the west would refuse to accept the twenty-four and a half years purchase which the hon. Member for Waterford obtained.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): That statement has been made before and publicly contradicted. The figures of the Land Commission have been published more than once. The statement is wholly untrue.

*MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH said that of course he accepted the statement which the hon. Member for Waterford had made. But at any rate the purchase price that the hon. and learned Member had obtained was an exceedingly satisfactory one. There would be abundance of land in the West of Ireland to be obtained if the Congested District Board had the funds to offer a similar price. To ask landowners to sell these lands not at such a price as might be agreed upon but at the valuation of the Congested Districts Board, or, worse still, of the Estates Commissioners, was unjust. There was another provision in the Bill of which he desired to speak, and that was the provision to increase the bonus payable to the vendor in proportion to the lowness of the figure at which he agreed to sell. He believed that that extraordinary idea was suggested by one of the Estates Commissioners in his evidence before the Viceregal Commission. To a lawyer's mind the whole arrangement as to bonus provided by the Act of 1903 was a very doubtful one when it was considered how many vendors of land were limited owners. It was a sort of legislative bribe to owners to sell, even if they were only tenants for life, as they thereby got the bonus percentage for themselves. The Act of 1903 carefully guarded against abuse by the zone system of prices, whereas the present Bill went in quite a contrary direction. It held out a direct bribe to the limited owner to sacrifice the interests of those in remainder. The cheaper the tenant for life agreed to sacrifice the estate the more he put into his own pocket. An old tenant for life, whose interest from age and encumbrances might be merely nominal, could by selling the property at fifteen years purchase get a personal gift of 15 per cent. of the price; while a conscientious tenant for life who stood out for twenty-three years purchase, less than the hon. Member for Waterford got, and less than Land Conference terms, would get no bonus at all. Such was the idea of an Estates Commissioner, whose decision on prices the Bill proposed to impose on owners. Surely he could not have realised the effect of his words when he suggested such an idea. He (Mr. Fetherstonhaugh) intended to vote for compulsory purchase of tenanted lands. He would vote for any amendment of the Act of 1903 that was well calculated to carry out the purpose and intention of that Act, but he could not vote for such expropriation of untenanted lands as the Bill proposed, nor for any clause that offered bribes to limited owners to commit fraud on those who came after them. He begged to move the rejection of the Bill.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said the admirable speech of the hon. Member for North Dublin who seconded the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill had certainly made the task of those who followed him in support of the Bill very much easier than it might have been, because he had relieved them of the necessity of endeavouring to explain any of its provisions. The Bill was undoubtedly a comprehensive one. It dealt with a great many points of the Irish land question, which, as the hon. Member for North Dublin had truly said, was not settled or nearly settled. At the outset he wished to offer a word of explanation. There were two very important aspects of the Irish land question with which this Bill did not attempt to deal—the finance of Irish land system and the administration of the Acts. They had deliberately abstained from including in their Bill either of those great subjects, because they were really subjects for a Government measure, and a private Member's Bill could hardly usefully attempt to deal with them, although they were questions of vital importance. The financial position of Irish land purchase was at present in an impossible condition. It was impossible for the Government, in his opinion, to leave things as they stood. Ireland had been startled within the last few weeks by the large demands which had been made upon the ratepayers of the country to meet deficiencies in the land system of finance, which it seemed the Treasury had been obliged to take a fortnight to explain. They could not explain it in reply to a Question, and it was a most astonishing condition of things that that should be the case. The Treasury must have ordered these demands to be made on the Irish ratepayers and yet they were unable to explain why. He thought the reason they delayed answering was that they knew that the storm of indignation which would be raised in Ireland would be very great indeed, and they were considering what was the most plausible answer they could give. The ratepayers of Ireland could not say, however, that they had not been warned and repeatedly warned. There was hardly a Member sitting around him who had not in the last three years warned the ratepayers and the tenants of Ireland that they were not justified as Irishmen in assenting to these extravagant prices, because by so doing they were putting a burden on the ratepayers which would bankrupt and destroy the whole community. In his opinion these demands were only the first few raindrops of the coming storm in regard to the finance of Irish land, and the whole public of Ireland, and not the tenants alone, were threatened with financial demands which would be infinitely in excess of the capacity of the country to meet. In his opinion the Government ought to appoint some expert Committee of inquiry, with representatives of all the interests concerned, including, of course, the Treasury and the ratepayers of Ireland, to inquire into the narrow subject of the soundness or unsoundness of the financial arrangements in respect of land and to report without delay. It was unnecessary for him to recapitulate the main features of the Bill. Its object was, first, the abolition of the zones; secondly, the organisation of the bonus on a rational and just basis, so that it might carry out the intention of Parliament; and, thirdly, the provision of compulsory powers. And then there was the second part of the Bill, to which he attached little less importance than to the first part, as it removed certain grievances in the rent fixing and general arrangements of the Land Court. These were grievances which had been again and again protested against by Irish Nationalist Members. The promoters of the Bill did not make their proposals with any intention or expectation that the old dual ownership system and the rent-fixing system would be revived as against the system of purchase and sale. They had no such expectation, and they held that it was essential to the just and sound working of the provisions of sale which were being carried out that access to the Land Courts under fair conditions should not be denied to the people. Thus, those landlords who were seeking to force people to pay unreasonable prices for their holdings by the use of the machinery of intimidation and pressure now in their hands would have notice that the tenants had an alternative policy; if they did not get fair terms of purchase they would be able to go to the Land Court which was set up by Mr. Gladstone for their emancipation. That was the reason why the promoters of the Bill proposed the necessary alterations in the rent-fixing portion of the Land Court. He believed that if these amendments were introduced into the law it would not have the result which some people feared, of producing an immense crop of demands for judicial rents. It would emancipate the people of Ireland from the intimidation and pressure to which they were subjected by the landlords. The first great provision of the Bill, to which he attached primary importance, was that abolishing the zones. He never had any doubt in his mind as to what the effect of the zone system would be. He had always held and said, while the Bill of 1903 was going through the House and ever since, that the zones combined with the reduction in the rate of interest on the money advanced for purchase and the approval of the reduction of the sinking fund, would result in an enormous and dangerous rise in the prices paid for Irish land. That rise was dangerous to the Irish public, dangerous to the tenant, and in the long run, it would be dangerous to the Treasury, because, although he agreed with the hon. Member for North Dublin that the Treasury had fenced itself round with a triple wall of Irish security before loss could fall upon it, did anybody believe if all the tenantry in the west and other portions of Ireland were reduced to begging and were unable to pay their rent that, in spite of the triple wall, the Treasury would not have to bear some loss? All these elements, therefore, were interested in a sound system of finance. He noticed long before the Act of 1903 was proposed that every year at the landlords' conference the first article of their creed was the abolition of inspection for security, and he said to himself that even if his own moderate intelligence and acquaintance with arithmetic and finance did not inform him, these gentlemen knew what they were about, and if they were so exceedingly anxious for the abolition of inspection for security, they must have an object in putting it in the forefront of their policy. What had been the operation of the Land Purchase Acts up to now? This was an ordinary everyday transaction which was constantly taking place under his own eyes. In regard to a purchase transaction the landlord very often put on pressure in order to induce a tenant to accept his terms. There might be arrears, there was the hanging gale, and there might be a threat to deprive a man of turbary or one of the other innumerable means possessed by Irish landlords for coercing their tenants. The agreement for purchase laid down a certain price, but then the Government valuer came down in order to estimate the security, and in many cases he cut the price down ten or twenty per cent. The effect was that landlords who owned similar estates in the district had ceased to attempt to squeeze the tenants, because they knew by the experience of their neighbour that if they did so they would only be put to the expense of making a new agreement, as the old agreement would be disallowed. The result was that silently and almost unobserved a certain rough standard was set up in regard to price by the Government inspectors, who were the only protectors of the tenants against the landlords, and the end was peace, because it would no longer pay the landlord to put on pressure. But the moment that condition of things was removed in consequence of the clamour of the landlords under the zone system—an abominable system—the landlords were allowed and even invited to put on all the infinite varieties of pressure which they still possessed in spite of the Land Acts. These restraints having gone it was to the landlords' distinct interest to squeeze the tenant by every means in his power to agree to the higher price. What was the result? As the hon. Member for North Dublin had said in his admirable speech, the landlords thought that the slightest reason would justify an increase in the price of agricultural land. As the consequence of these transactions the price of land in Ireland had risen in three years by six years purchase. The hon. Member had, however, understated the case, because the price of purchase of land in Ireland had risen on the average all over the country by seven years purchase. In addition to that, the bonus which the House voted in order to enable poor tenants to meet their landlords had been grasped by the latter. That very feebly stated the grievance and the injury which had been inflicted upon the tenants of Ireland. In one district the price had doubled. He could take any hon. Member to the county of Galway and show him two estates side by side, one sold under the Ashbourne Act for twelve years purchase, and the other under the 1903 Act for twenty-four years purchase, and the bonus in addition—twenty-seven years purchase. But that was not all: the forces of the law had been let loose by this Act, and in his own division three landlords were prosecuting their tenants for old arrears of rent in order to compel them to sign agreements for twenty-four years purchase of land which in his opinion was not worth seven years purchase. He would call the attention of the House to the last Report of the Estates Commissioners—an invaluable document which he wished all Englishmen would study. He asked hon. Members to look at the table which set forth the average price of land for the whole of Ireland for the five years preceding the passing of the Act of 1903. That was worked out in terms of cash, and Members should keep in mind the fact that as years went on the number of second term rents included in those purchases had rapidly increased. From 1897 to 1903 the number of second term rents must have been rapidly on the increase. These were the figures for prices of Irish land: second term and first term rents were all lumped together: in 1899 the average price was 19·4 years; in 1900, 19·1 years; in 1901, 18 years; in 1902, 16·8 years; and in 1903, 17 years. He protested against the notion that the purchase should be based on first term rents. Purchase should be based on a fair rent now, and because a man was drawing to a close of his first term rent, which ought to have come to an end under the Scottish system in seven years, and under the system recommended by the Committee of 1894, in ten years and had been unable to exercise the right of getting a second term rent he protested against the first term rent being used. What was the result of the Act? The average number of years purchase paid in case of sales by landlords direct to tenants with the bonus was equivalent to twenty-five and a half years purchase to the vendor, an increase of something like 50 per cent. on the price in the year immediately preceding the passing of the Act. It had been said, "Oh, but that does not represent the true facts of the case, because in the previous figures you are dealing with first term rents and the last with second term rents. In reality the prices now are just on a par with what they were before." He was very glad the Estates Commissioners had come down to the bedrock and given the price per acre. The average rates per acre paid for all classes of holdings sold by landlords direct to the tenant under the Land Purchase Acts before and since the passing of the Act of 1903 were as follows: Under the Act of 1885, 10·8 cash; Act of 1901, 9·2 stock; Act of 1903, 13·4 cash. That was up to 31st March, and the average rate per acre paid during the five years immediately preceding the passing of the Act of 1903 was 8·9 stock, which amounted to less than £8 in cash, against 13·4 cash paid under the Act of 1903, exclusive of bonus, which with the bonus would realise £15 per acre. The rise had not been justified by anything in the nature of agricultural values. As every farmer in Ireland knew to his bitter cost, the profits of his holding were being steadily eaten into by increased cost of labour, and he hoped in that respect they would be more eaten into. It was far more difficult to make a living out of Irish farming to-day than it was ten years ago, and yet these men were asked to pay 68 per cent. per acre more for the land than was the case before the Act of 1903 was passed. It was to put a stop to that system that they were anxious to do away with the zones. He remembered during the discussion on the Act of 1903 there was a great deal of contention as to what the effect of these zones would be. In his opinion the effect would be to raise the price of land in Ireland to twenty-five years purchase. The right hon. Member for Dover said that was an outrageous statement, and said that what the Government had in contemplation was eighteen years purchase. He (Mr. Dillon) had turned out the truer prophet. The fact was, the zones had raised the price of land to the middle point between the two zones, and that was twenty-five years purchase. But they were not without full warning as to what the intentions of the landlords were. He would read a short extract from a letter written by a leader of the moderate landlords, Mr. Lindsay Talbot Crosbie. That gentleman, writing to the *Irish Times* of 25th April, 1904, said—

> "It is thus perfectly clear that all the facilities afforded by the employment of State credit and all the bonus or grant in aid is given to the tenant; the tenant and the State between them have to make up the price which they have both agreed should be given to the landlords. Somewhere about twenty-eight years purchase is what the landlord requires, and it is quite immaterial to him how this is made up. If the tenant can give twenty-five years purchase and the State three—which is about what the £12,000,000 would do—the transaction will go forward."

That was the deliberate intention of Mr. Talbot Crosbie, an intention he had done his best to carry out. His idea was twenty-five years purchase from the tenant and three years from the State. Therefore he (Mr. Dillon) was perfectly justified in the forecast he made as to the effect of the zones. One great argument constantly used by landlords in Ireland was: "What right had the State to interfere in a free bargain made between the landlord and his tenant? They were agreed that the best course was to sanction the bargain." Those who took that view knew little of Irish land. That was the old argument used against Mr. Gladstone in 1881. He remembered Captain O'Callaghan when they went down and started a campaign on his estate. It was a very hot fight on the most rackrented estate in the whole of Ireland. What did Captain O'Callaghan say? He was charged with rackrenting, and he wrote a letter to the Press, and said a more grossly unjust charge was never made against an Irish landlord. He said he never rackrented his tenants. The people fixed their own rents. "I put up my farms every seven years, and the people fix their rents themselves." That was the old idea of rackrenting. The Irish tenant was not a free agent in these bargains, and until hon. Members get that into their minds they did not know the A B C of the Irish land question. The tenant was no more a free agent in settling the price of his farm than he was in settling the rent of his farm in Mr. Gladstone's time. In his own district at the present moment landlords were proceeding for rent at dates at which they never called for them before, because these people had refused to sign bargains to pay twenty-four years purchase for land that was not fit to maintain a family even if it were rent free. Therefore, he said the withdrawal of the zone system ought to be brought about. The price of Irish land had been inflated in a manner most dangerous to the Irish community and to the State. It was no wonder that hon. Members who were landlords should be enthusiastic for the Act of 1903—the only men who came off with flying colours were the Irish landlords. Hon. Members talked about their net incomes. Why, landlords now would look with contempt upon their net incomes. He would tell the House of a case that came under his notice. A man had a small estate, from which he never drew a penny of rent for fourteen years. He came over to Ireland after the Act of 1903 was passed, sold his estate, and went back to England saying that this Act was the greatest ever passed, for he was able to secure an income of £400 in gilt-edge securities with the money he received for the purchase of his estate. That was net income in the opinion of some Irish landlords. Another case, illustrating the idea of net income, was that of the Duke of Leinster, one of the first to sell on the security of £1,250,000 of the taxpayers' money. The Duke sold at a price of twenty-four and a half years purchase and he got a bonus from the State of £112,000; he promptly invested the whole sum in 4½ per cent. security, and added six or seven thousand a year to his net income.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): Quite right.

MR. DILLON: Yes, but was it for that that the Act of 1903 was passed? He was delighted to have that interruption. Was it for that the State advanced the money, that dukes and earls who were millionaires already should add five, six, or seven thousand a year to their net income? Let him turn to one other aspect of this zone system. Let him take an estate in the south-west of Ireland, near Castletownbere, the Pelham-Clinton estate. There the landlord demanded twenty-four years purchase. The tenants, headed by their parish priest, offered eighteen. The landlord would not listen. There was a dispute; the landlord served notice of eviction, and the tenants fortified their houses. That was a nice way to make a bargain. That was the kind of thing into which the Irish people were driven; the tenants fortified their houses and prepared for war. If they had not fortified their houses they would have been compelled to pay twenty-four years purchase, or, at least, twenty-two. Then under the new regulations which the Government substituted for the old regulations under the Land Act last March, and which had been most beneficent in their operations, the Estates Commissioners had power to offer their mediation, and they did offer it, and the landlord agreed to allow the Land Commissioners to send their inspector upon the estate. The Commissioners had no power of compulsion, and if the landlord had been like Lord Clanricarde he would have told them to go to the devil. What was the result in this case? The result was that a schedule was drawn up by the Commissioners under which the tenants were divided into classes. The higher classes were fixed at twenty years purchase, the next at nineteen years purchase, the next at eighteen years, the next at seventeen years, the next at sixteen years, and the next at fifteen years. Bridget Brennan was fixed at twelve years purchase, and Charles O'Neill at twelve years. Non-judicial rents were graded at an average of nine years, and first term rents were graded on an average up to twelve years purchase, coming down to seven and a half years purchase, and in the case of the seven and a half years purchase the poor unfortunate man, who was scraping his living out of that wild country, if his farm had not been valued, and if the tenants had not fortified their houses, would have had to pay three or four times the price——

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.) said it was owing to the intervention of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover that the evictions were abandoned. He intervened between the landlord and the tenants, and Canon McDonnell and he (Mr. Gilhooly) had an interview with the agent, and if it had not been for the intervention of the right hon. Member for Dover the evictions would have been carried out.

MR. DILLON: That may be true.

MR. GILHOOLY: It is quite true.

MR. DILLON said he was not questioning the statement at all. It did not affect his argument, but rather strengthened it, because, according to that statement, it was only the refusal of the Chief Secretary to carry out the law that prevented that eviction. He humbly submitted that that was not the way to ensure respect for the law, and that it was far better for the Government so to amend the law as to cause it to do justice instead of driving unfortunate tenants into fortifying their houses in order to get justice, and then having the Chief Secretary coming in and refusing to put the law into force. Let him take another case of the operation of the zones, the case of Mr. J. D. Crosbie, in which the Court of Appeal gave judgment the other day. Mr. Crosbie acted perfectly frankly in the matter. The question was whether arrears could be added to the purchase price, and whether, having added these arrears, the landlord was to get the bonus upon the arrears as well as on the price. The Estates Commissioners thought that a large order, and the Land Judge decided against Mr. Crosbie; but it went to the Court of Appeal. The British Treasury were appalled by the idea that they were to advance British money—Irish money in reality—to pay off these irrecoverable arrears, and in addition give the bonus. What was the judgment of the Court of Appeal? They gave judgment to the effect that the Irish landlord was undoubtedly justified in adding what arrears he could get tenants to agree to pay to the purchase price, which was to be advanced by the Commissioners, and that he was entitled to the bonus on the added price. In the case of Mr. Crosbie's estate, the amount of arrears added to the purchase money was not large, and he did not say that Mr. Crosbie treated his tenants badly, but it was the principle he objected to. Outside of a lunatic asylum there never was a more outrageous principle than that in large parts of Ireland where these rents were not real rents, but were impossible rents, where, in many cases twelve, thirteen, and fourteen years arrears had been carried on over the heads of the people for years and years, the Treasury should be called upon to advance, at the risk of the Irish ratepayers, money to pay landlords those irrecoverable arrears, with the bonus in addition. That was a most monstrous condition of affairs, and it was one which, if it alone stood against the zone system, ought to damn it. In this case it was brought out that a farm on which large arrears—if he remembered rightly, amounting to £243—had accumulated, was a second term judicial rent; it was fixed so high that the man was unable to pay it, and Mr. Crosbie would have made him pay if he was able; that bad debt was to be shifted on as a burden to the ratepayers of Ireland, while the landlord walked away with twenty-four years purchase. He would give one other case illustrative of the effect of the zones, because he was really very anxious to destroy these provisions. In the case of the Baker Estate there was a large farm in the county of Tipperary, of which the rent was considerably over £200—a judicial holding—and an application came before the Commissioners for an advance of £4,500. That sum was within the zones, and that being so, the Commissioners had no right but to advance the money, without inquiry. It so happened, however, that the solicitor, residing in the City of Dublin, got alarmed before the transaction was concluded, and through no virtue of the law, which gave the Commissioners no power to interfere, but through the awakening of the conscience of the solicitor—he was glad to find some solicitors had consciences—notice was given to the Commissioners that the transaction was an unusual one, and they were invited to pronounce upon it. What was that transaction? Mr. Commissioner Bailey in giving judgment said—

> "It was admitted that the advance of £4,500 applied for by the tenant, apparently for the purpose of enabling him to purchase his holding, was made up as follows—seventeen years purchase of rent, £3,400; addition for arrears of rent, £740; and a further addition of £410 to be refunded to the tenant by the owner when the advance was made, to be used by the tenant to pay off a family charge of £350 and an old bill for £60 for rent."

It was all within the zones, and all would have been advanced but for the Dublin solicitor. Let the House observe that the zones sanctioned that; the effect would be that the credit of the State was to be used for the payment of old family charges, and that had been done on many estates. The system had been largely resorted to in Ireland when the landlord and tenant agreed to apply for twenty-five years purchase, and the landlord agreed to give back two years purchase as a bribe to the tenant. The tenant being a poor man might find that a potent argument which he could not resist, and the Irish taxpayer was sacrificed. He thought that was a corrupt arrangement, although one recognised by the Government. If that transaction on the Baker estate went through, in a case where the solicitor was, he would say, more scrupulous than most solicitors for their clients, the State would have advanced money for private purposes at 2¾ per cent., and the landlord would have obtained the bonus. If he wanted to borrow money it would be quite another story, but landlord and tenant entering into a corrupt arrangement were able to do what he had described. That was the result of the zone system in Ireland. He appealed to the Government not to allow the grass to grow under their feet in putting an end to a system which was hurtful to every class, dangerous in a general way to the community at large, and most dangerous to the well-earned reputation for honesty in making their payments which had been won by the Irish tenantry. With regard to the bonus he would say deliberately that outside of Bedlam nothing more ridiculous was ever put into action. The House would never have passed it except for the relief of a great necessity in Ireland, to oil the springs of an essential industry. It was naturally understood that the bonus was to be at least as much for the benefit of the tenant as of the landlord, but he need hardly say that that disappeared the moment the Act was passed. The tenant never benefited one farthing by it, and he greatly feared he never would. He had said that the present system was a bad system. What was the system? It was this: That the greater the price the more bonus the landlord got. The great gift of £12,000,000, intended to settle the cases of the poor tenantry in the West of Ireland, and generally to make it possible to buy out the poor estates, had been seized upon by the great landlords of Ulster and Leinster, who had obtained under it prices which would make the mouth of any English landlord water. He asserted positively that no English landlord dreamt of getting such prices. And the bonus was availed of by the landlord to squeeze the last cent out of the tenants. Their proposal was very simple: that the man who got more than twenty-three years purchase needed no inducement to sell, whereas the man who sold at a low price required the inducement. Their proposal was one which would make the bonus of some use. He would give the House one instance—a recent instance—of the way in which the bonus was being used. He had mentioned the case of the Duke of Leinster who increased his income by £7,000 a year. Was it for what happened there that the House of Commons passed the Act of 1903? Well, the Earl of Shaftesbury was selling near Belfast at the present moment, and was holding out for twenty-seven and a half years purchase, and if he got that he would at the same time obtain a bonus of 12 per cent. to reward him for the great sacrifice he was making in parting with his lands on those terms. At the same time, if the landlord of a poor estate in Connaught sold at ten or twelve years purchase he would only get half the amount of bonus. Could there be imagined a more criminal waste of the money of the State than that which was accomplished under such a system? He would now say a word about the question of compulsion. The hon. Member for Fermanagh did not undertake to oppose the principle of compulsion, but he drew a picture of the delay in the working of purchase that would be produced by the application of compulsion. He was a lawyer. Heaven protect the Irish tenants from lawyers of that kind. He drew a picture of the delay that would ensue. There was not a single iota of force in his contention. Every single condition he dwelt upon as the result of compulsion existed in the present law. The whole matter of delay or expedition in carrying through sales depended upon the efficiency and adequacy of the staff, and nothing else. In the discussion of the Act of 1903 great weight was laid on the argument with respect to zones, but they had really had no effect on the expedition of sales. He did not pretend that the land of Ireland could be sold in less than five or six years, though he was absolutely certain that it would be possible, by proper machinery, to sell the whole of the land of Ireland within, at the very outside, the next six or seven years. Until the land was sold they would have Ireland studded all over with points of disturbance, which was a most unfortunate condition in which to keep a country. The question of sales was a question of staff. Once they set the law right and doubled the number of men on the staff they would double the quantity of land sold in any single area. There was no difficulty about it, and the whole operation would not be so costly, because the entire business would be soon brought to an end. Nobody would deny that the operating cause which brought about the series of Acts of which the Act of 1903 was the culmination was the disturbed and restless state of the country. If Ireland had been composed of properties like the Leinster and Shaftesbury estates, did they suppose that they would have had all these land Bills? It was a cruel irony of fate that the very men who brought about these great legislative reforms were left in misery still and untouched by them. That was the unanswerable ground on which they claimed compulsion. Unless they had compulsion the present condition of things would go on; and those districts where land purchase was least urgently required would be precisely those districts in which the Act would operate, and the west, south-west, and north-west would be left to stew in their misery, and to create trouble and embarrassment for Chief Secretaries to come. How could a Liberal Chief Secretary face that condition of things with any degree of equanimity? These western people had suffered and fought and won for others that which was denied to them—the right to live decent, civilised lives in the land of their fathers. Could the right hon. Gentleman tell them to wait indefinitely, and that the law must be carried out? It was very difficult for the Chief Secretary, and especially a Liberal Chief Secretary, to see the law carried out. Morally speaking it would be impossible to move great armies of police to carry out the law. Yes, but in what sense to carry out the law? By enabling the landlords, who were deliberately defying the oft-repeated policy of the House, successfully to persist in their defiance, and to maintain a system which had been condemned by the moral sense of England as well as of Ireland—a condemnation which had been sealed by the great Act of 1903. The question was one which would abide no delay. They knew the state of things in the present session, and they were aware of the difficulties, but he most earnestly warned the Government that unless they held out to those western people some such definite hope as was held out by the right hon. Gentleman at the opening of the session—the results of which were more beneficial than perhaps he would ever know to the evicted tenants in Ireland—it would be impossible for Irish Members to give counsel, or if they did give counsel to enforce it upon the tenants, and it would be beyond the limits of human nature to endure what was now going on under their eyes in many instances, namely, great ranches, which within the memory of living persons were inhabited by some of the finest peasantry that ever inhabited any country, being left desolate wastes that it was appalling to see; it would be impossible to teach the people patience when these great ranches were being taken from them by the cupidity of the landlords and graziers—stolen from them, perhaps for ever.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) regretted that the hon. and learned Member for North Fermanagh had left the House, for there were one or two statements of his to which he wished to refer. The hon. Member had said first of all that some of those engaged in this warfare had practically been guilty of a breach of faith, and that he looked upon the Bill itself as nothing less than the breach of a treaty. The second statement which he made was a more extraordinary one, namely, that one of the virtues of the Act of 1903 was that it compelled whole estates to be sold and prevented their being sold in parts. There never was a greater misapprehension of the facts, and if the hon. and learned Member had been present he would have called his attention to a singular case in point. Mr. Denny, a landlord in the hon. and learned Member's own constituency of North Fermanagh, was engaged in selling his estate, upon which there were some eighty or ninety tenants. He was quite willing to sell to the whole of the tenants, save one, and that one was Mr. Edmund Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell was the oponent of the hon. and learned Gentleman at the late election, and Mr. Denny, whilst willing to sell to all his other tenants, absolutely declined to sell to Mr. Mitchell on any terms whatever. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why?] It was not for him to say why. All he had to say was that if the Estates Commissioners declined to purchase because of Mr. Mitchell being excepted—on purely political grounds, he believed—they would have to deprive eighty or ninety tenants of the benefits of purchase. There was not any doubt whatever that all over Ulster people were being left out of purchase agreements for various reasons, and it was a total mistake for the hon. and learned Gentleman to say that the Act secured the sale of estates as a whole. As to the breach of treaty, if he had arrived at many of the conclusions of Nationalist Members on this question, it was because Irish landlords had driven a coach and four through the whole of the arrangements made at the Land Conference and under the Land Act of 1903. What was the arrangement into which the Irish landlords entered when the Land Conference sat? The main arrangement was that the landlords should be secured their second term net income with a fair equivalent for the first term rent. That was accepted by the Landlords' Convention, so that the whole of the Irish landlords, as far as their organisation could bind them, agreed to those terms. That was the contract he himself had entered into as a member of the Land Conference; and that was the contract which the Irish landlords had deliberately and ruthlessly broken. They on their side had not been guilty of a breach of contract. Hon. Members opposite had not been guilty of a breach of contract in introducing this Bill. It was perfectly certain that a great measure like the Act of 1903 would require amendment. This Bill was more than amendment, he agreed; but, whatever it was more had been rendered absolutely necessary by the deliberate breach of faith on the part of the Irish landlords. Let him point out that the zones of the Land Act were not the same as the zones of the Land Conference. In the zones under the Act the price under which sales could be made without inspection was fixed at from 10 to 30 per cent. reduction on second term rents. The zones of the Land Conference were from 15 to 25 per cent. The change was radical. The 10 per cent. reduction enabled the landlord to get the advantage. The tenant never got the advantage of the 30 per cent. reduction throughout the whole progress of the Act. In Ulster estates were being sold right and left, estates belonging to Members of the House, estates belonging to men who attended the Land Conference, and who agreed to what the Conference decided. They sold at 10 per cent. reduction on second term rents. What did that mean? It meant close upon twenty-seven and a half years purchase of those rents and three years bonus in addition—thirty and a half years purchase of second term rents. Would anybody tell him, would the right hon. and learned Gentleman on the Opposition Front Bench contend, that that merely secured the landlord his second term rent? Was that carrying out the terms of the Land Act, or the terms the landlords entered into with the tenants' representatives? The Duke of Leinster's estate was only a sample; many had added thousands of pounds to their incomes by the Act of 1903, though they had covenanted before the whole country that they would be content with the terms which he had stated. That was a deliberate breach of faith on the part of the Irish landlords. On the question of compulsion he had listened to the hon. and learned Member for North Fermanagh with a great deal of interest. He was glad to think the hon. and learned Member was in favour of compulsion, though he did not think the time had come for it. He (Mr. Russell) would take a case in his own constituency—the estate of Benburb. There were 800 tenants, seven-eighths of whom were what were called loyal men. Most of them were Orangemen. He knew every family on the estate, which was a model one. There was probably not £10 of arrears on the whole place, and the tenants were fairly comfortable men. All round the estate men were buying right and left. The Benburb tenants had offered high terms, but on that estate an impossible price was asked. How long was that to continue? Had they a right to draw a ring fence of occupying owners round these men who were ready to buy but were prevented from doing so? Had a single landlord, a rich and powerful man, the power to thwart the will of Parliament and tell his tenants, "Unless you pay my price, you shall not get the privileges which your neighbours round about you have got?" When was the time for compulsion to come? That case could be matched in every part of Ulster, and the time had come for Parliament to say that the tenants should not be treated in that way, at the will of one man, who was setting aside the clear will of Parliament. Such instances made the case for compulsion. He did not deny that there were very great difficulties in the way of carrying out a complete system of land purchase. He did not doubt that there were great difficulties in the way of compulsion; he did not question the financial difficulties, but they had put their hands to the plough and they were bound to go forward. He did not take the ground that there would be trouble if something were not done. In Ulster they were not given to that sort of thing. [AN HON. MEMBER: They never do anything.] He agreed that they never did anything to bring about a change, and that was the reason he said it. They never did anything; they only reaped where others had sown. Parliament was morally bound to see this thing through, and to prevent such difficulties arising. Let him give another instance of how the Act might be evaded. He would take Section 5 of the Act, the most extraordinary section ever put into an Act of Parliament. When the Bill of 1903 was being discussed they contended that it was not fair to put non-judicial tenants, who had never had a rent fixed, on the same terms as men who had had their rent fixed, either a first or a second time. They said that those rents had never been revised, and that the principle that applied to rents which had been fixed ought not to apply to rents which had not been fixed. The then Chief Secretary opposed them, but after a very long debate, lasting more than a day, the Government consented to exempt those men, and to put them under a special clause by themselves. That was to say, they recognised that the prices ought not to be so high as in the case of rents which had been fixed. A new clause was brought up. There was all too little discussion of the Act of 1903; there was anxiety to get it passed at all hazards and costs. What happened? The clause was brought in, and it was now Section 5. It provided for the non-judicial tenants, and allowed the Estates Commissioners, after taking all the circumstances into account, to fix a fair price. It fell into the hands of the law officers of the late Government, and how did it turn out? It turned out that all the circumstances of the case and the interests of the parties merely represented the interests of the landlords and the remainderman, and that the interests of the tenants had not to be taken into account at all. What was happening? Parliament had tried to protect these men, but they were actually paying higher prices under Section 5 than under the zones. Could they be accused of being guilty of a breach of treaty if they asked that these things should be rectified? Then there was the bonus. He agreed with the Member for East Mayo that the present arrangement as to bonuses could not possibly last. Those who were engaged in the discussion outside Parliament had, some of them, contended for a bonus; but they were laughed at, and the idea that Parliament would ever give a bonus was ridiculed. But their contention in the country and when they reached the

House was that the State should intervene and make up the difference between what the honest tenant could pay and what an embarrassed landlord could afford to accept. That was the principle on which the bonus was founded and passed. What had happened? Why, the landlord had taken the highest price, twenty-seven and a half years; he got all he wanted, and he collared the 12 per cent. bonus as well. The whole thing was impossible, and could not be put before any Parliament and accepted; it must be revised or go. There were other parts of the Act which he thought ought to receive more attention than they had been given. When they passed the Bill it never was intended, and they never believed that those zones would be applied to congested districts. Unquestionably the Land Conference exempted the congested districts. They specially declared that they should be subjected to altogether different treatment from the ordinary parts of the country. He spoke for himself at all events. When the Act passed he had no idea that it would be possible for the Courts so to construe it as to apply to congested districts. Yet it had taken place. If any of them wanted to have a picture of Irish landlordism, and what it was capable of, he asked them to think of Irish landlordism at the Land Conference, full of moderation, full of fair play, full of a desire to settle the question, and then tranfer themselves to the Congested Districts Commission, sitting sometimes at one place and sometimes at another; and he advised them to get a mental photograph of Mr. W. H. Boyd. He advised them to read his evidence. Mr. Boyd was representative of Irish landlords. That gentleman was adopted by the Irish Landlords' Convention, and he sat for five or six days in the witness chair, and there was no antiquated principle of Irish landlordism which he did not revive. Such men seemed to forget that they were not the owners of the soil as an English landlord was. Much of their land belonged to the tenant. The landlord got the land for nothing in the main and never did anything for it. He would be perfectly willing to agree to what he signed at the Land Conference if the landlords would keep their share of the bargain, but they had freed him from the compact because there was not a paragraph in their Report they had not destroyed.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said he could not address the House in the stirring tones of the hon. Member for South Tyrone or of the hon. Member for East Mayo. In the few remarks he desired to make he wished to deal with the question in moderate terms. He must express his surprise at hearing the hon. Member for South Tyrone say that because of what certain landlords had done he freed himself from all the obligations, promises, and undertakings he agreed to at the time of the Land Conference. All he could say was it was a very serious and strange position for a person occupying the position of the hon. Member to take up.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I am afraid I have not made my meaning clear. What I did mean to say was that while I am still ready and willing to give an Irish landlord the privilege of his second term net income, he has broken every engagement at the Land Conference, and therefore I do not feel myself bound to stand by the Land Conference so much as I did at first.

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that was exactly what he understood the hon. Member for South Tyrone to say. Taken all round and not the isolated cases mentioned by the hon. Member for East Mayo and the hon. Member for South Tyrone, the landlords of Ireland as a whole had acted absolutely up to the spirit of the Land Conference and to the spirit which dictated the Act of 1903.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked how many landlords had sold at twenty years purchase.

*MR. CRAIG said he would tell the House what had happened in his own part of Ireland. He happened to be the landlord of a small property in Ireland, and after the Act of 1903 became law his tenants came to him and asked if he proposed to sell. He said he would, and they asked for his terms. The majority of his tenants had second term rents fixed, and those who had not he fixed by agreement for the purpose of the sale. He then offered to sell at a reduction of 20 per cent. from the second term rents, which offer was accepted. That was exactly half-way between the top and bottom limit of the zone, and his tenants agreed to those terms. That transaction was typical of the vast majority of transactions in Ireland. [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] He was quite sure that was the case. It had been admitted from the Irish benches that one of the chief objections to the zone system was that it stereotyped the middle price as the price to be paid all round. It had undoubtedly done so in the majority of cases, and landlords and tenants had agreed to an arrangement by which the land was sold at the middle price, a state of things which was contemplated by the Act of 1903.

MR. FLAVIN asked if the hon. Member contended that the Act of 1903 fixed the price at twenty-four years purchase?

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the Land Conference laid down that the landlord was to receive the equivalent of his net income, and a 20 per cent. reduction on the second term rents produced almost exactly that sum. If that were conceded, if it were allowed that by far the greater number of transactions which had taken place under the Act had had that effect, then there could not be any reasonable objection taken to the Act of 1903. It seemed an extraordinary thing that three years after the passing of that Act they should be asked to reverse entirely the policy which was acquiesced in at the time by all parties. He claimed that it had not been shown that the Act of 1903 had failed. There might be isolated anomalies, and it was impossible that in the administration of an Act of such magnitude it could be otherwise. His point was that the cases which had been cited did not necessarily bear the construction which had been placed upon them. Even if they assumed for the moment that they were as bad as they had been pictured it was no argument against the Act of 1903. With reference to the zone system of which the hon. Member for South Tyrone had said so much, and which he seemed to look upon as one of the worst points in the Bill, the zones were arrived at in the Conference between the landlords and tenants. Roughly speaking, since 1881 rents had on two occasions been revised in Ireland, once after the passing of the Act of 1881, and then after the lapse of fifteen years from that date. The whole question of the value of a farm was thoroughly gone into in the Land Commission Court and formed the basis and data on which the fair rent was fixed, and it was properly felt by both landlords' and tenants' representatives as well as by the Government of the day, that it was unnecessary that every estate should be re-examined, and the question of the security of the purchase money gone into a second time, and that it would only occasion expense and delay to do so. It was felt that the operation and fixing of fair rent had settled the question sufficiently clearly for all the purposes of the Act of 1903. He maintained that the Government of the day had fulfilled all the obligations upon it in seeing that the holdings were security for the money paid upon them. It was urged that the zones should be removed, and that the Government should see that the current price for land in Ireland was considerably reduced from what it was at present. That was not fair. The House of Commons three years ago and the Land Conference practically settled what was to be a reasonable price to be paid for land in Ireland. That was the chief subject discussed at the Land Conference, and in the House, and the conclusion was deliberately arrived at that a reduction of something between 20 and 40 per cent. would be the proper basis for fixing the price for land in regard to which a fair rent had only been fixed once, and something between 10 and 30 per cent. the price of land where second term rents had been fixed. That conclusion was deliberately arrived at, and there was no reason why, seeing that the decision was come to only three years ago, it should now be violently uprooted and changed by the removal of the zones. Absolutely no case in the course of the debate had been shown why that should be done. He disagreed with the hon. Member for East Mayo on the picture he had drawn of the ordinary landlord in Ireland coercing his tenants. That picture was more than exaggerated, because except in very rare cases it was absolutely untrue. The ordinary landlord in Ireland did not coerce his tenants, and even if landlords were inclined to use coercion they had not got the powers to do so, they had no weapons. But in Ireland the landlord had no desire to coerce his tenants. While he was a landlord had he possessed the desire to coerce his tenants he had no earthly power to do so. His tenants' rents were fixed once every fifteen years, and so long as they were duly paid—and they always were—he had no power over them at all. He did not know whether the picture drawn by the hon. Member for East Mayo was intended to create the impression that it was typical of the ordinary landlord in Ireland, and that he seized every opportunity of bringing pressure on his tenant to pay a higher rent than he could afford. If such a time ever existed it had passed away years ago, and now the rents were fixed by the Land Courts, which were absolutely independent of both landlord and tenant. It was hardly necessary to point out that hon. Members below the gangway represented the tenants alone in this matter. He did not claim to represent the landlords particularly, because he owed his position to the votes of a good many tenant farmers. He entered Parliament in 1903 when this question was uppermost in the minds of Irish representatives. There was a great amount of feeling on the subject in the North of Ireland at that time. The complaint of hon. Members below the gangway was not so much that the tenant was paying too much for his land, but that the landlord was getting too good a bargain. The idea now seemed to prevail that no matter what terms the tenants got, whether they were good or bad, the landlord must at all costs be prevented from making even a tolerable bargain for himself. He would have thought the object of the Nationalist Members would have been achieved if the tenant made a good bargain and acquired his farm at a reasonable price. It was distinctly understood that under the then existing circumstances something more would have to be given to the landlord than had been given in the past in order to bring about a sale. He did not think they had a right to go back now on the principle which guided the House in the passing of the Land Act of 1903. The cases in which landlords had reaped an unfair advantage from the Act of 1903 were very few and far between, and the vast bulk of them had parted with their land on terms and conditions which had left the tenants in a better position than they were before and at the same time had secured the landlords the net income they were getting before the passing of the Act. That was the proper picture to draw of the operation of the Land Act. Instead of being looked upon as a failure, the Act ought to be considered one of the most sucessful measures ever passed. With regard to the Leinster estate he deprecated that the landlord there should be able to make such a large profit out of the sale of his estate to his tenants. It was not his wish that that should happen, and he was sure it was not the wish of the House when the Act was passed. The hon. Member for East Mayo referred to the Leinster estate as a bad case and objected to the Duke of Leinster receiving £1,112,000. He agreed that that was a very large sum of money, but the hon. Member omitted to tell the House that in receiving that immense sum there were a very large number of persons who were turned from tenants to proprietors of their farms, and the annual amount payable by each of these tenants was probably reduced by from 15 to 20 per cent. Would the hon. Member for East Mayo have raised the same objection if the immense estate of the Duke of Leinster had been in the hands of five or six landlords instead of under one landlord? He claimed that the arrangements made on that estate were satisfactory because the tenants were perfectly satisfied. He did not think the House of Commons ever intended that the landlords should make a profit out of the Act. He did not think any good purpose would be served by going into the instances mentioned by the hon. Member, for, even if the facts bore the construction put upon them, they were not typical but exceptional cases, affording no ground or argument for the complete reversal of the principle embodied in the Act of 1903. The hon. Member for East Mayo had called the bonus a fatal gift. [NATIONALIST cheers.] He attributed those cheers to the intense dislike which hon. Members had of the landlords getting anything out of the land. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: They have already got too much.] The whole objection of hon. Members to the Land

Acts was not that the tenants were not getting fairly good terms, but that the landlords were getting far too good terms. If they looked at the question from that point of view they were not likely to arrive at a satisfactory solution of it. The hon. Member for North Dublin County had said that Ireland could not afford to wait any longer for compulsory powers. But even if a Bill for the compulsory acquisition of land were passed to-morrow they would have to wait a considerable number of years before they could get the purchases carried out. The argument of the opponents of the Bill was that there was no use passing the measure now when they had not even the money required by the Voluntary Act at present in force, and working wonderfully well. It was a fact that at no time since the passing of the Act of 1903 had the funds at the disposal of the Estates Commissioners been at all adequate to deal with the cases brought before them at any one moment. That was really the one unfortunate fact in connection with the Act which every Irishman who was anxious for the transfer of property from the landlords to the tenants must deeply deplore. He did not say that there had not been very fair reason for the shortness of money, but it was that fact which had deterred not only landlords, but tenants, from entering into agreements for purchase or sale of holdings. The fact that there was not sufficient money to finance the transactions made it uncertain whether, under an agreement entered into, no matter how clear or simple, the landlord would receive the money, and that the tenant would actually become the owner of the farm for two or three, or possibly five years. In the circumstances persons could not be expected to make bargains. He felt convinced that, apart from one or two exceptional cases which might either now or at a later date require some exceptional treatment, the Act of 1903 was bringing about tenant proprietorship of the land in Ireland at a rate which was at least as quick as would be secured by any compulsory system that could be introduced. With reference to any exceptional cases or districts which might exist—he had no doubt they did exist—where possible requirements were not met by the provisions of the Act of 1903 he said, "Let there be fresh legislation on fair terms." He was not a representative particularly of the landlords, although he might be called upon to champion their cause from time to time in the House of Commons, and he said that if fresh legislation was necessary to deal with the peculiarities of exceptional districts, precisely the same principle must be adhered to in dealing with those cases as was adhered to in the Act of 1903. That was to say, a landlord, whether in the west, south, or any other part of Ireland, must not be asked to part with his property unless he was properly compensated for the same. They had heard of land being sold at seven, eight, nine, or ten years purchase in the West of Ireland. He was afraid his knowledge of the West of Ireland was not sufficient to enable him to say whether those prices were proper or not, but what he said was that if a man was receiving a rental of a certain amount in the West of Ireland where, he presumed, there were fixed rents as in other parts—[NATIONALIST cries of "No"]—if a man was receiving a certain rental from his property, and if in the view of the Land Commission it was likely to be of as much value twenty years hence as to-day, and if that man was forced to sell, he should be assured of a definite income equal to the net income he was at present receiving out of the land. It was a perfectly fair thing to ask. He was certain that if the landlords in the West of Ireland or other exceptional districts were assured that they would receive an income which was approximately equal to the present second term rental, there would be no more difficulty in getting them to sell their property than in the case of landlords like himself in the North of Ireland, who had availed themselves of the Act of 1903.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said they might congratulate themselves that all the hon. Members who had taken part in the debate had advocated the continuation of the policy of selling the land of Ireland to the tenants, which was initiated so far back as 1869, which had been going on ever since, and to which the Act of 1903 gave a great impetus. The hon. Member for South Antrim had represented the Bill now before the House as a complete reversal of the Act of 1903. He did not take that view at all.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I said as regards the compulsory provisions of the Bill.

Mr. CHERRY said that he would deal with the Bill in detail. He could not answer in a moment questions with respect to all the matters it contained. He would endeavour to show, and the House would judge whether he succeeded, that the effect of the Bill would not be to set aside the Act of 1903, but to carry it out in its essential details. The Act of 1903 had provided great benefits for the landlords. It had given them a market where there was no market before. It had given them a bonus of 12 per cent. It had enabled money to be advanced on such reasonable terms, by enlarging the period of repayment, that tenants were induced to give larger prices than they had previously given. The average price of land had risen by six or seven years purchase since the passing of the Act of 1903. Therefore the landlords had undoubtedly obtained very great advantages in addition to the bonus. Had the purchasing tenants obtained similar advantages? [An Hon. Member: "Yes."] His hon. friend said "Yes," but he himself did not think they had. The purchasing tenants looked to purchase price with reference to the annuities paid rather than to the amount of money. Comparing the annuities before 1903 with the annuities under the Act of that year, it would be found that they were very much the same in proportion to the rent, and that the purchasing tenant was not receiving any substantial reduction. Before 1903 the annuity ran for a shorter period, and was subject to a decadal reduction. Now it ran to sixty-eight and a half years without any hope of remission. If anyone examined impartially what had happened, it was clear that enormous benefits had been conferred by Parliament, benefits which were intended by Parliament to be equally participated in by both landlords and tenants, but which had been practically monopolised by the landlords. That had been the effect of the working of the Act. He did not want to throw any discredit on landlords who had sought to get high prices, but the practical effect had been that the advantage had been obtained by the landlords and not by the tenants. He understood that the main object of the Bill now before the House was to secure a more equal distribution of the benefits. The object, as hon. Members opposite had stated, was to seek to reduce the amount of the purchase money so that some share of the benefit which was intended by Parliament for the tenants would be obtained by them. The State also had undoubtedly a great interest in the matter. The risk involved in the high rates of purchase which prevailed in some districts was a very great one, whilst that involved in the absence of any investigation as to security was also very serious. It was a matter of interest to everyone to see that the prices paid were not excessive but represented the fair value of the land. He did not propose to go through all the clauses of the Bill, but would deal with what appeared to him to be its main features and endeavour to show how far the Government considered its provisions desirable, and how far they were able to give their support to them. The effect of the first clause would be practically to abolish the zone system and to establish a system of inspection in all cases of sales, whether in the case of judicial or of ordinary tenancies. He had never been particularly enamoured of the system of zones. He had always thought that it was rather a risky transaction. The advance of money by the State in large sums without any investigation at all was a system open to the obvious danger that fraud of various kinds might be perpetrated. He believed that in some cases there had been fraud. There was nothing to prevent the tenant who was willing to help his landlord agreeing to a rent absurdly above the value of the land and getting the land on a twenty-seven years purchase, and then the two dividing the purchase money between them. Unless there was some investigation as to security a transaction of that kind might be successfully carried through. Then again rents were fixed for a period of fifteen years, and the rent-fixing authority only took those fifteen years into account. It was quite possible that in respect of turbary, at the end of fifteen years all the turf might have been entirely cut away. On a great many farms the turbary was a consideration which was taken into account. The question whether there was sufficient turbary to last fifteen years was considered, and a considerable portion of the rent was in respect of turbary which was not security. When they applied the zone the term would not be for fifteen but for sixty-eight years, and there was the risk that all the turf would be cut away and that no security would remain. That showed that the mere fact that judicial rent had been fixed at a certain sum could not be safely taken as proving that a particular holding was fit to bear for sixty-eight years annuities only 10 per cent. less than the amount of the rent. He had no hesitation in saying that some modification of the system was necessary and must be enacted by Parliament. He would suggest one modification at least as desirable, namely, that in every case where judicial rent had been fixed by agreement the Estates Commissioners should be directed to inspect the holding. Fully one-third of the judicial rents had been fixed not by the Courts but by agreement. In such cases there was no certainty whatever that the rent represented the value of the holdings as fixed by a judicial tribunal without including the tenants' improvements. Further, rents were frequently fixed by agreement between the parties in cases which were excluded from the Land Acts. The transactions so carried out sometimes involved the fixing of rents at amounts far higher than would be fixed by the Court, and that was a matter which must be considered, because the rents in such cases might have a bearing on the purchase prices. He thought also that it might be desirable to deal with the zone system. The Estates Commissioners should have discretion, if they thought right, and if they had any reason to think that the purchase price was too high, to make an investigation into the whole merits of the case. Another provision of the Bill which entirely commended itself to his mind was that which enabled and, he thought, required the Estates Commissioners, when considering a case outside the zones, to inquire into the question of the equity of the price as between landlord and tenant. As the hon. Member for East Mayo had pointed out, it had been ruled by the learned Judge that Section 5 of the Act of 1903, which directed the equity of the price to be considered before a loan was sanctioned, referred to the equity, not as between the landlord and tenant, but as between the tenant for life effecting the sale and the persons in remainder. They all knew that, in cases where there were a large number of tenants on an estate, there were some exceptional tenants who had not the same privileges as their neighbours owing to the large amount of arrears, and that great pressure was put put upon them, not only by the landlord, but by their fellow-tenants, to agree to what was more than a fair price for the holding in order to carry through the sale of the whole estate. He thought that was a case in which the equity of the price ought to be investigated, and he could see no reasonable objection in point of law against its being done. As to the bonus, it had been pointed out that the effect of the present arrangements was actually to stimulate a man to obtain as high a rent as he could. Was that just? Was it reasonable and right that a man should get a higher bonus because he got a high price for his land? If the bonus was intended to help the tenant to buy as well as the landlord to sell, the logical thing to do was to make the bonus vary inversely with the number of years purchase obtained. But if Parliament did not sanction such a radical change, he thought it was desirable that there should be some limit to the number of years purchase on which the bonus was paid, say up to twenty-seven or twenty-eight years. Under the Act of 1903 the scale of bonus came up for consideration every five years, and, therefore, it would have to be considered next year. When the matter did arise the question of the distribution and the payment of the bonus would be considered, and the Government would endeavour so to use the money available for the bonus as to promote its distribution in those parts of the country where the sales were most wanted. The parts that most wanted it on the ground of the poverty of the people were generally the last to obtain it. In the prosperous counties like Kildare and the North of Ireland tenants were anxious to take advantage of the legislation, and the landlords were anxious to sell; but in the West and the South it had been found difficult to carry out a voluntary arrangement. It was desirable that something should be done, and he hoped something would be done to alter the system. As to the question of compulsion, those who voted in favour of the principle when in opposition were not going to shrink when in power from putting it in force. The principle was in full operation now in several respects; and he did not think any great complaint had been made. A Royal Commission was appointed by the late Government to consider the case of Trinity College. It was presided over by Lord Justice Fitzgibbon, and there were two other Commissioners equally learned and influential. Some of their recommendations were distinctly in favour of compulsory purchase, in order to get rid of the tangle of dual ownership. If the principle was applied in that case, what arguments could there be against extending it to other cases also? If ever there was a case in which the principle should be applied, it was to those congested districts in the West of Ireland where the holdings were so small that people could not possibly live upon them, and where immediately adjoining them were large ranches of grazing land fit for distribution. As regarded compulsion it had been pointed out that it was a question of money. The Government could not commit itself to an immediate application of the principle of compulsion without providing the means. Money must be provided by the Treasury, and the machinery, troublesome and difficult, must also be provided by Parliament. So far as the present year was concerned, if this Bill was fortunate enough to pass, the question of the compulsion as regarded direct sales certainly could not be entertained. He thought all were agreed that the sales actually agreed upon under the Land Commission ought to be completed before they applied the principle to other cases. As regarded untenanted lands in congested districts the case was quite different. A Royal Commission was now sitting with reference to that matter, and, he hoped, would shortly publish its Report. If that Report recommended the adoption of compulsion as the necessary means of getting possession of a sufficient amount of land to carry out the objects which the Commission recommended, the Government would not hesitate to adopt their recommendations and put them in force as far as they could possibly do so. But pending the Report of the Commission he did not suppose that any hon. Member would expect the Government to pledge themselves to adopt the principle even as regarded this matter. In reference to sporting rights, he thought there was a great deal to be said for the view that they should in all cases be conveyed with the land to the purchasing tenant. The reservation of sporting rights was apt to cause friction and annoyance, and he did not see why they should be dealt with differently from other rights attaching to the land. He thought that the good relations between the farmer landlord and the farmer tenant would be better promoted by the landlord letting the sporting rights go to the tenant. Already in some cases, in the county of Waterford, a good deal of trouble and annoyance had been caused by the reservation of the sporting rights. It was all a question of price, and the price should be arranged on the assumption that all rights should pass. As to minerals, he did not understand on what principle the Act of 1903 provided that a man who had sold his property out and out and had been paid full value should, perhaps twenty years hence, on the discovery of coal or other minerals under the land, be entitled to 25 per cent. of the gross profits of the working of those minerals. What claim had he to the 25 per cent? He had sold the land on the assumption that the mineral rights were of no value. Surely if there was a loss to the ratepayers in Ireland through the financing of the Land Act the proceeds of any minerals subsequently discovered ought to be applied towards that rather than to the former owner. It seemed to him a reasonable thing that such rights should be used not for the benefit of the former owner but for the benefit of the public generally. Of course existing rights must not be interfered with, but future rights ought to be vested in the Land Commission for the purpose of financing the Act. With reference to the amendment of the Land Law Acts and the rent-fixing portions of the Bill, the question of improvements was at the very root of the Irish land question, and they were bound to see that in the fixing of rents as well as in the sales of property every tenant secured the full benefit of all improvements made by him or by his predecessor. In no case should the rent be fixed on improvements made by the tenant, and the tenant be compelled to purchase improvements which he had himself made. Power should be given to the Commissioners to investigate each case within or outside the zones to see whether the rent was fair and reasonable, and whether the improvements on the holding had been included in the purchase price or not. Another provision which was harmless and against which not a word had been said, was that which provided that tenants who had lost the *status* of present tenants by eviction, should for the future be treated as present tenants and enabled to have fair rents fixed. He could see no reasonable objection to that. He did not suppose there were many such cases—[An Hon. Member: There are between 50,000 and 60,000 of them]—but whether many or few, he saw no reason why a man who was a present tenant and who forfeited that position owing to default in paying rent—for which he might not have been to blame—should not be allowed to have a fair rent fixed, and the purchase price fixed on the fair rent. It was also proposed to repeal Section 7 of the Act, but that was not a matter upon which he thought he ought to make any pronouncement of policy at that moment. The House was fully engaged, and he feared the chances of the Bill passing this session were very slight; but the Government would support the Second Reading, because they approved the principle contained in the Bill, and because, in their opinion, it not only did not contradict, but carried out, the intentions of the Legislature in passing the Act of 1903, and would promote the wellbeing of Ireland in the future.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said it would be a very unwelcome and startling piece of news to the English taxpayer to find to-morrow morning, when he read his paper, that the arrangement contained in the Land Purchase Act of 1903, which he was led to believe was to be a final settlement of the difficult and complicated question of land purchase in Ireland, and on the faith of which he consented to lend £100,000,000 to Ireland and to give as a free gift £12,000,000, was to be no final settlement after all, but an instalment leading up to the larger policy of confiscation and compulsion. It was certainly not a little startling that, within four years of the passage of the Land Purchase Act as the result of what was, at any rate, believed to be a concensus of opinion on all sides of the House that it contained within it the materials for an ultimate and final settlement of the question, those who took part in that arrangement should be told, not merely by hon. Members below the gangway from Ireland, but also from the lips of the representative of His Majesty's Government, that practically the settlement arrived at in 1903 was now to be torn up and treated as waste paper. He had gone through every section of this Bill, and he ventured to say that there was not one but bore upon it the stamp of injustice and confiscation. What were the main and essential elements of the arrangement or compromise, arrived at in 1903, with the approval and almost the applause of all sections of the House? The essential elements of the Land Purchase Act of 1903 were, first the absence of compulsion, secondly, the system of zones, and thirdly, the bonus. These three things were the essential and material conditions for the successful passing of that measure, and they were all the special subject of attack in the present Bill — an attack made with the approval of his right hon. friend opposite. Yet the right hon. Gentleman had told them that the effect of this Bill, the express object of which was to disrupt and disturb everything which was arranged, and as they thought concluded, in 1903, would be simply to supplement and carry out the policy of the Land Act of 1903. What was the purpose of the zones? In the first place, it was to do away with the necessity for all that complicated legal investigation and judicial decision which had been found to clog to such an extent the operation of the ordinary rent fixing Acts passed prior to 1903, and the hon. Member for Waterford, standing up in his place to comment on the Land Purchase Act, had stated that in his opinion the great merit of the proposal was that the tribunal or body of gentlemen to whom the duties under the Act were to be entrusted were to have no judicial authority, but were to be non-judicial and purely administrative. Unfortunately, that was not the view these gentlemen took of their own functions, and their desire to acquire judicial discretion and power for themselves resulted in a majority of the Estates Commissioners from the first displaying a most active and patent hostility to the zones. By the zones, it was proposed to get rid, by a sort of automatic system based upon fair and reasonable lines, of the necessity for all these judicial investigations. How was it proposed to do that? First of all, he would ask hon. Members opposite to recollect, what perhaps had been forgotten, that the system of the zones applied only to the purchasing tenants who had had judicial rents fixed, and the proposal was that, in the case of tenants who had had their rents fixed on only one occasion, in order that the purchase should go through automatically and without inspection, they should get a further reduction of at least 20 per cent. on their judicial rent. In other words, every tenant coming under Section 1 of the Land Purchase Act of 1903 if he was a first term tenant was to get at least 40 per cent. off his rackrent, 20 per cent. being taken off by the fixing of the first term, and 20 per cent. under the Act of 1903. That was not a bad bargain for a purchasing tenant, because he was to start in the first place with an immediate reduction on his original rent of 40 per cent. and after a certain period of time the rent, which took the shape of an annuity, would cease altogether. But more than that, what was to be the bargain in the case of the second term tenant, whose purchase was to pass through automatically under Section 1 of the Act? Speaking in round numbers, practically the assumption was that by the first fixing of the rent the tenant got a reduction of 20 per cent., and that he got a somewhat similar reduction on the second term. Therefore, if he was a second term tenant, coming in under the zone, he was to get a further reduction of at least 10 per cent. on his rent, so that his original rent was to be reduced by 50 per cent. and the rent was to be changed at that figure into an annuity which was to cease after a certain number of years. It was suggested that all that was done in the interests of the landlord. It was done in the interests of both landlord and tenant. It was part of the arrangement. He would not say that that arrangement was assented to by hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, because he agreed that the hon. Member for East Mayo was a bitter opponent of the zone system from the first, but on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite there was no protest of any sort or kind raised against the system incorporated in the first section of the Act of 1903. What was the result of that? The system had been attacked because by virtue of it the landlords had got a certain number of years purchase in excess of those which prevailed before the Act of 1903 was passed. Everybody who knew anything about Ireland was aware of the real cause and the true explanation of that state of things.

It was given in the most graphic way in which it could be given by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford himself, who in season and out of season had with conspicuous courage, loyalty, and honour, stood by what he believed to be the spirit of the Land Conference and the spirit manifested by all Parties in the House when they passed the Act of 1903. In addressing a meeting in county Wicklow, in that year, the hon. and learned Gentleman said that he met a farmer who said to him—

> "We farmers do not think we shall gain much by this Land Purchase Act of yours, because we have got to give twenty-two or twenty-three years purchase, when we could under the Ashbourne Acts have purchased for eighteen years."

The hon. and learned Gentlemen said he asked the farmer why he did not purchase under the Ashbourne Acts, and the farmer said—

> "My landlord would not sell."

That was the real explanation of the matter, and as the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Tyrone—whom he was glad to welcome back to the House after his severe illness and who always contributed so effectively to debate—had pointed out, the main reason why land purchase before the Act had almost ceased in Ireland was that the landlords were not willing to sell at the prevalent prices. The hon. Member had said that the bankrupt estates could be got rid of by eighteen years purchase, as could also the estates of landlords who had only a small property in Ireland as compared with large estates elsewhere and who, being wealthy, wanted to get out of the country. That class of landlord did not care whether it was seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen years purchase, but now those two sets of landlords had been exhausted. They had got rid of the bankrupt landlords and the landlords who were prepared to sacrifice their property with a view of getting out of the country, and they now had to deal with the men who wanted to get a fair price for their property. Therefore the prices prevalent before the Act of 1903 could no longer be relied on, and some fresh inducement was required to bring the property of the remaining landlords into the market. It was with that express view and object that the system of bonus was devised and introduced into the Irish purchase legislation—in order to give to the solvent landlord who hitherto had been unwilling to sell at the prevalent prices an inducement to part with his property. Yet the hon. Member for East Mayo had in that debate denounced the bonus, because, forsooth, it had gone into the pockets of solvent landlords.

Mr. DILLON said he did not denounce the bonus, but he denounced the distribution of it.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that was precisely the point he was making. The hon. Member denounced the bonus because it went into the pockets of the landlords—into the pockets of the Duke of Leinster, and other persons who the hon. Gentleman said had no right or claim to it. But it was impossible to please the hon. Member. "Hit high or hit low," he never was satisfied. He said there was no reason why the Duke of Leinster should have this money, because he was a wealthy man, but then he complained in regard to the case of a landlord who had parted with his property, and had had to leave the country with a sum which was only capable of producing £100 a year. There was no satisfying him, and the result was that the Act of 1903 was to be torn into shreds. When hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway brought in Bills he always looked carefully into them to see whether there was anything with which he could agree, and he did not in this Bill find anything. There was one point made by the hon. Member for East Mayo which was a grave and serious matter, but which was unfortunately not in this Bill. He referred to the claim made by the Treasury in certain districts of Ireland in regard to the alleged losses on land stock. Speaking from his recollection of the Act of 1903, the hon. Member said he believed that to be a breach of faith. So far as he himself understood the financial provisions of that Act, however, it amounted to this, that the county councils were only to be responsible for the burden when they neglected to obtain these instalments. He did not think the Act made the county council liable to make good the loss sustained in floating land stock. The most extraordinary feature of this Bill was that for the first time in Irish legislation it introduced coercion with regard to the Irish tenant. He did not know if hon. Members had read the Bill, but he thought it would come as a surprise to them that by one section of it power was taken to buy the holding of a tenant who did not live on it. As everyone knew, in Ireland many farmers lived in the villages, and any tenant who lived in a village or town and held a farm in the vicinity might have that farm under the compulsory powers of this Bill purchased compulsorily by the Estates Commissioners. [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] By one section power was to be conferred on the Land Commission compulsorily to purchase the holding of any tenant who did not live on it.

MR. DILLON said the hon. Member was quite wrong.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL assured the hon. Member for East Mayo that he was absolutely right.

MR. CLANCY: You should read the Bill.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he proposed to do so. Clause 3, Section 1, provided that the Land Commission should have power, for the purpose of providing parcels of land, to purchase "any untenanted land not being land purchased under the Land Purchase Acts, or may purchase any tenanted land on which the tenant does not actually reside." [NATIONALIST cries of "Go on."] There was nothing further in the section.

MR. DILLON said the hon. Member was absolutely wrong. The Bill was perfectly clear—"or may purchase any tenanted land on which the tenant does not actually reside, or which does not adjoin, or is not ordinarily used in conjunction with the holding on which he so resides, and on which a fair rent cannot be fixed under the Land Law Acts."

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he failed to see the force of the interruption. His point remained exactly where it was before the interruption. [Cries of "No."] He had no hope of reaching the intelligence of some hon. Gentlemen, but there were some who had some intelligence and anyone who understood the King's English would see at once that two cases were dealt with—first, where the tenant did not live on the holding, and, secondly, where he had another holding which was not used in conjunction with the one on which he lived. Those were the two cases, and in either of them power was given to the Land Commission to buy it up against the tenant's will. But coercion was also applied in respect to sporting rights. If a tenant purchased to-day and left to the landlord the sporting rights the landlord gave something more. The Bill proposed that in every case, whether he liked it or not, the tenant should be compelled to take over the sporting rights, the only reservation being that he could reserve them to the landlord for the landlord's life. Fine preservers of game the tenants would be! Did hon. Gentlemen think in the case of a tenant with four or five acres, on which he lived when he was not away at work in the fields of England or elsewhere, that that tenant would ever become a preserver of game? If that section was carried there would be an end to game preservation in Ireland. As to the bonus, the Bill contained the provision that the smaller the purchase price the greater the bonus, and there was no provision to protect the remainderman from this manifest bribe. A more unjust or dishonest suggestion it would be impossible to conceive. Under the Act of 1903 any dispute as to easements or boundaries was by agreement to be referred to the Land Commission. The Bill proposed to take away that voluntary jurisdiction and to make it obligatory upon any party to a dispute to submit it to the Commission, if any one person applied for a hearing; and that was proposed by the very same hon. Gentleman who in 1903 hailed the Act of that year with such delight because it created a non-judicial body with nothing but administrative functions. The real cause of the late delay in land purchase was not so much a want of money as the want of sufficient staff. Another reason was that they had been devoting themselves with great diligence to the restoration of evicted tenants. He did not quarrel with that, except that it had been overdone. The hon. Member for East Mayo in 1903 said there were only about 800 families of evicted tenants, and he thought about 400 of those cases had been already disposed of. He believed that to-day there were over 5,000 or 6,000 applications from evicted tenants pending before the Commissioners, and the Estates Commissioners had in reality turned themselves into a manufactory of evicted tenants. The thing had become an intolerable abuse. The introduction of this Bill was to be attributed to the very unhappy and mischievous speech which the Chief Secretary made in reference to the Marquis of Clanricarde.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): Not at all.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that when the right hon. Gentleman referred in a jaunty and flippant way to the expropriation of landlords he was afraid he did not realise how dangerous it was to trifle in that way with landlords in Ireland. He opposed the Bill on the substantial ground that it was a distinct violation and rupture of the treaty supposed to have been arrived at on the question between all parties in 1903.

MR. BIRRELL said he had no objection whatever to being lectured by the right hon. Gentleman, but if he might make a suggestion to him he would beg of him not to apply to his most serious observations, made with the full sense of responsibility, the expressions jaunty and light-hearted, of which he was beginning to get a little tired. He spoke perfectly seriously, and he did not think that those terms should be applied. Neither did he ever suggest the expropriation of Lord Clanricade, or that he should be deprived of the emoluments he obtained from his estate. All that he suggested—and the suggestion had been made by men of greater weight than himself—was that sometimes in the history of a country they might come across landlords whose property might very well be vested in the hands of a committee, who would exercise all the rights of ownership in a way more consonant with the general feeling of the country than Lord Clanricarde had hitherto exhibited. That was not expropriation.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: It is very like it.

MR. BIRRELL: Not at all. If the right hon. Gentleman mismanaged an estate which brought him in £16,000 a year, and he (Mr. Birrell) took it and brought in £17,000 a year, what wrong did he suffer? On the contrary, it was very much better to substitute a sensible man than to retain a foolish one. It was with very much trepidation that for the first time in his life he plunged into the jungle of the Irish Land Law. When he had to cross the dangerous bogs of the finance of the Act of 1903 he wished his lot were cast in pleasanter places. He thought anybody looking at this particular measure would agree that the three principal provisions in it were those relating to the zones, to the extension of the principle of compulsory purchase, and to the bonus. Upon those points he did certainly protest very strongly against the notion that it was not open to any member of that House to introduce measures to amend the Act of 1903. It had been apparent for some time, and he ventured to say there was not a single intelligent man in Ireland or elsewhere conversant with the working of the Act who was not thoroughly convinced that it did need, and would benefit by, some amendment. Certainly the gentlemen representing the great body of Irish opinion and the tenants of Ireland, who were intended to be benefited by that Act, were at liberty to attempt its amendment, and any Government to whom they presented the measure was bound to consider whether or not it contained suggestions which ought to be thoroughly investigated. He was not in Parliament when the Act was passed, but he was bound to say that, if he had been in Parliament he would have known nothing more about the zones than the present occupants of the smoking-room. There was no Imperial law which required people to take an interest in any question which did not concern them, and he had never heard of a measure of the importance of this Act which had received so little notice either from the public or from the ordinary Members of the House. He confessed that until he became Chief Secretary he did not know what zones were. It was a fantastic term not found in the Act of Parliament; only in the rubric. Nobody would, however, deny that the object of zones was, in the first instance, to create areas of free bargain between the landlord and tenant, in which the Treasury was left out of account; and inspection of the property was not required to ascertain the goodness of the security and the equitableness of the bargain, unless the tenant could show that he was under duress. An arrangement of that kind in a matter which involved the whole value of the land of Ireland—a great deal more than £100,000,000—showed that the complaisance of the Treasury in those days was at a very high-water mark. He did not think anyone would deny that the zones system had increased the price which the landlord had obtained. It had tended to fix the price at an amount equal to twenty-four and a half years purchase. That was a greater number of years purchase than was contemplated by the landlords themselves. He did not blame anybody; it was one of the results which had followed from establishing this arbitrary system of zones. He thought, therefore, they might well review the question of zones; that they required some modification. With regard to compulsion, he had pledged himself to apply to that House during this session it might be for the necessary powers to enable him to restore evicted tenants. He was still enthusiastic enough to believe that it was a noble work to attempt to restore evicted tenants to their holdings. It was not the case that where they had an evicted tenant they immediately got a holding. The investigations that were going on had resulted in the exclusion of a large number of persons who had made this claim. The object of the Government was that the evicted tenants, be their number great or small, after investigation, should be restored either to their original holding or to some other land. If for that purpose compulsory powers were necessary, they would be applied for, and they would, he did not doubt, be granted by

Mr. Birrell.

that House. The general question of compulsion all round brought him to the question of the finance of the Act, and he spoke, subject to the Treasury, with some natural anxiety on the subject. He did not think he would be doing his duty if he did not call attention to the present grave position of the financial obligations of the country. Under the provisions of the Acts the cost of flotation was thrown, in the first instance, upon the Irish development grant, and, secondly, upon the guarantee fund. The Act of 1903 gave the landlords cash instead of stock, and enlarged the number of years which the tenants had for repayment from forty-eight to sixty-eight and a half. The result, he thought, was that when they went to the market to obtain the money necessary to supply the wants of the landlords and the tenants they had to submit to a loss of something like 12 per cent., which on £1,000,000 spread over sixty-eight and a half years amounted to a very considerable sum. They had thrown upon the Irish development grant a loss of £70,000 a year. It was quite certain that by the time they had obtained £10,000,000 or £15,000,000 of money, in order to carry out this system, the Irish development grant would be bankrupt and exhausted. That being gone, they would have to fall back on the guarantee fund, and in a very short time the loss on the flotation of loans necessary to carry out land purchase would have to be borne by the ratepayers of Ireland. Then there was the other loss, not by flotation but by certain banking operations, amounting in two years to £72,000. A man who bought on the 1st March obtained on the 1st July the whole of the percentage from the previous January. That was one of the transactions which had contributed to this loss. The other two might be described as banking losses occasioned by the dealings between the National Debt Commissioners and the Treasury. But they found they would continue. There was no reason to suppose they would stop, and those also had to be borne by the county council rates. The whole scheme of land purchase under the Act of 1903 would most certainly be endangered if the ratepayers of Ireland found that they had to pay heavy contributions. That was a matter that would have to be gone into. He mentioned that because it lay at the bottom of the whole case of general compulsory powers. He was afraid they could serve no useful purpose by obtaining compulsory powers to buy up the whole of the land of Ireland when they had not got the means—the present machinery having broken down—of obtaining the necessary funds. He could not contemplate a proposal which would increase the demand for advances from £10,000,000 to £40,000,000, right up to the £160,000,000 that would be required, until they had reviewed the whole question of the finance of the Act of 1903. He did not wish to speak in any alarmist spirit, or to disturb the equanimity of the people in Ireland, but they were face to face with a great and grievous financial difficulty in this matter, and it would be absurd, rash, and improper on his part to hold out any hope of his being able, by any proposals such as those contained in this Bill, to increase the area of this work. Compulsion, no doubt, would have to come. The Act acknowledged that it must come, and the Government had acknowledged that it must come in the case of evicted tenants. If the Congested Districts Commission recommended compulsion, the Government would accept the recommendations of that Commission if they commended themselves to their minds.

All that they could do; but he was afraid that was all they could do at present. The Government were willing to agree to the Second Reading of this Bill because they found many parts of it capable of approval. Many of its clauses they were perfectly ready to adopt, and they were quite prepared to consider the Bill in a proper spirit. When they would be able to deal with the matter themselves he was unable to say; but, in his opinion, Parliament would fail in its responsibility if it did not express its intention of dealing at an early date with the whole question.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said there was a reply to the two main parts of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. The first was his contention that his Party was at liberty to make the alteration contemplated by this Bill, and the second was his reference to the question of finance. The Act of 1903 was not hastily arrived at. They worked at it for over two years before it was presented to the House. The Act had naturally failed in certain directions, but if they accepted this proposal for remedying that failure, they would run themselves into a greater difficulty which the Act had been drawn to avoid. He would almost lay it down that they could not revert from the cash basis of the Irish Land Act. He thought all that had happened since the Act was passed proved that the late Government were right.

And, it being Five of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. JOHN REDMOND rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 136.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J. (S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W)
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitehead, Rowland
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Dalrymple and Captain Hervey.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 208; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 137.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn. Sir J T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Churchill
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M (Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Seddon, J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent

Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,.RtHnSirAlex.F.
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim, S.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House." —(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 61; Noes, 184. (Division List No. 138.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHnSir Alex.F.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone E.)
Cheetham John Frederick
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hervey,F.W.F(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mildmay, Colonel James
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col.Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)

Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSir JT (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst d
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk Bg'hs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smyth,Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

And, it being half-past Five of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at half after Five o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 22nd April, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas; Basingstoke Gas; Keswick Urban District Council (Water); Maidstone Gas; Hull and Barnsley Railway; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment); Brockenhurst Gas.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Tynemouth Corporation (Water Bill) [H.L.]. Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.]. Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee, one to produce documents.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 14th and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The Orders made on the 25th of February and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.]; Southend Water Bill [H.L.]; Southend-on-Sea Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl Cathcart be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Scarborough; read, and agreed to.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill; Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill; brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.]; Report from the Committee of Selection That the Lord Biddulph be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Seaton; read, and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.]; (No. 32.) A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Aston Manor (Extension to Erdington), Chesham (Amendment), Hipperholme (Amendment), Lytham, Newark (Amendment), Penrith (Amendment), Pontefract and Stockport (Amendment): And

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; (No. 33.) A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, containing the schedule of maximum tolls and charges applicable to the New Junction Canal of the Undertakers of the Aire and Calder Navigation—Were presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*); read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill; read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3.) Bill, brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 34.)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

JAMAICA.

Correspondence relating to the resignation by Sir A. Swettenham of his office as Governor of Jamaica.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, under the Coal Mines Regulation Acts, 1887 to 1896, the Metalliferous Mines Regulation Acts, 1872 and 1875, and the Quarries Act, 1894, for the year 1906; East Scotland District, R. McLaren; West Scotland, J. M. Ronaldson; Newcastle, J. B. Atkinson; Durham, R. Donald Bain; York and Lincoln, W. Walker; Manchester and Ireland, John Gerrard; Liverpool and North Wales, Henry Hall, I.S.O.; Midland, A. H. Stokes; Stafford, Hugh Johnstone; Cardiff and Swansea, W. N. Atkinson, F. A. Gray, and J. Dyer Lewis; Southern, J. S. Martin.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Reports of the Local Education Authority and of His Majesty's Inspector upon the educational fitness of Mr. Milnes for the position of head teacher of the Royston National School.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Aberdeen to the Secretary for Scotland under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1905–1906.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Order with respect to the urban county district of Cookstown.

POLICE ACT, 1890.

Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's certificate, under Section 17 (2) of the Act, to the River Tyne Police Force, for the year ended 29th September, 1906.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853-1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Licence granted by his Majesty to Thomas Thompson under the provisions of the Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891, to which are annexed conditions other than those contained in Schedule A. of the Penal Servitude Act, 1864.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (COUNTY OF GLAMORGAN).

Order made by the council of the county of Glamorgan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the Aber Town and Ystrad Mynach wards of the Caerphilly Urban District.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I beg to ask the noble Lord who represents the Foreign Office whether he is able to give the House any information as to the names of the delegates who will represent this country at the Hague Conference.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): The British Plenipotentiaries to the Conference will be the right hon. Sir Edward Fry, the right hon. Sir Ernest Satow, the right hon. Lord Reay, late President of the Institute of International Law, and Sir Henry Howard, His Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at The Hague. In addition naval and military expert delegates will be appointed, whose names will be announced in due course.

THE APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES.

*THE MARQUESS OF BATH rose to call attention to a memorial presented to the Lord Chancellor in December last year with reference to the appointment of Justices of the Peace, and to the reply of the Lord Chancellor thereto. The noble Marquess said: My Lords, I trust that no apology is necessary to your Lordships for drawing your attention to a subject of such importance as that which stands upon the Paper in my name. I desire to elicit the opinion of noble Lords, if I can, on the pressure which it is sought to employ, and which, in fact, is being employed in certain quarters, to compel Lords-Lieutenant to base, or, at all events, to colour, their recommendations for the office of county magistrate on political grounds, and, further, on the effort which is being made to transfer that pressure with the same object to the Lord Chancellor in the case of the Lord-Lieutenant declining to base his recommendations as desired. That is a matter which strikes at the root of the administration of justice, and it is for that reason that I venture to describe it as important and grave and as well worthy of the consideration of your Lordships' House which numbers so many Lords-Lieutenant among its members.

May I make two preliminary observations? Perhaps it may have occurred to some of your Lordships that it is presumptuous on the part of one who has occupied the office I have the honour to hold for so short a period to draw the attention of the House to this subject. I can only plead that it is precisely those who have the least experience who are most in need of guidance. The pressure to which I have referred has been greatly accentuated since the enactment of the measure of last year which abolished the property qualification for county magistrates. I make no complaint of that measure. I think I can confidently claim that I have honestly and frankly carried out its spirit and its intention. The second observation I desire to make is this. I wish to assure the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that I am bringing this subject forward in no partisan spirit, and, least of all, with any antagonistic feeling towards himself. I go further and say that I should be the last person who would desire in the least to embarrass him in the very difficult position he occupies. It would be impertinent if I were to attempt to praise the noble and learned Lord in his conduct of his office. But it would be equally ungracious and ungrateful if I were to fail at once to acknowledge the personal courtesy, the strict impartiality, and, may I venture to go further and say, the extraordinary industry and care which the noble and learned Lord has invariably displayed on every occasion on which I have had to consult him—and I believe that is the experience of others—with regard to appointments to the Commission of the Peace in the county, of which I have the honour to be His Majesty's Lord-lieutenant.

It is a matter of common knowledge that for the last fifteen years an agitation has been on foot to alter the system under which Lords-Lieutenant appoint county magistrates and to substitute their appointment by the Lord Chancellor direct without the intervention of Lords-Lieutenant. This agitation has been confined to one political party, and those who have taken part in it have suggested without hesitation that in making his appointments the Liberal Lord Chancellor should seek his sources of information from the Liberal Members of the House of Commons. This agitation took a concrete form in 1893, and I shall have to refer to what occurred then. But its latest and most active eruption took place in December last, when the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was the victim of a torrent of lava. The noble and learned Lord survived the shock, and, although he was threatened with a further display of volcanic violence, he seems, publicly at all events, not to have suffered.

I have no means myself of knowing whether the noble and learned Lord has been warned, by rumblings of a local and scattered character, of the imminence of another eruption, but I myself and others have had indications, which cannot be mistaken, that this volcanic activity is by no means set at rest. In December last a memorial was presented to the noble and learned Lord which complained of the partiality of the Lords-Lieutenant, which desired, as it was expressed, to put the system on a non political basis, and which alleged that the vast disparity between Conservative and Liberal Justices had grown up during the long domination of the Conservative Party. The memorialists then proceeded to explain how the system could be rectified, and they invited the noble and learned Lord to discuss the matter with them. The Lord Chancellor did not consider that much good would come of an interview, and I desire to draw your Lordships' attention to the opening sentence of his courteous and instructive reply. He said—

> "The memorial signed by eighty-eight Members of the House of Commons which you handed me begins by expressing an earnest desire that under some new system the appointment of Justices of the Peace should become non-political. All the remainder of the document takes for granted that the existing system must necessarily be one of appointment under 'political influences,' and in effect aims at making those influences more dominant and effective than hitherto while that system lasts. I agree in the initial aspiration, but cannot reconcile it with the remainder of the document."

That the recrudescence of this agitation is closely connected with the passing of the measure to which I have referred is shown by the language of the memorial. It states that—

> "The passing of the recent Act of Parliament removing the property qualification indicates a general agreement that the administration of justice should no longer be the prerogative of a single class, and that, particularly in view of the powers which should reside in the justices with regard to the drink trade, it is of the greatest importance to find, within reasonable time, improved means for making the county Benches more truly representative, both of political opinion and of the different social classes of the community."

I submit that it is clear from the language of the memorial, from a consideration of the history of the case, and from the pressure which is brought to bear on Lords-Lieutenant, that the aim of those who have combined to exert this pressure is not so much an improvement in the administration of justice, as a political colouring of the Bench, and the extension of political patronage.

For what purpose is it desired to give a political hue to the county Benches? I regret to have to do so, but I am bound to say—it has been forced on my mind by both observation and experience—that in some quarters, at any rate, there is a hope that the political views of intemperate partisans appointed on political grounds may colour the administration of justice in various quarters and in a variety of ways. This movement, I think it will be acknowledged, is manifestly organised. Many of the recommendations that have been sent forward have not been confined to individual cases, but have been in squadrons and platoons. It is a remarkable fact that it is only since the last general election that these lengthy lists of nominations have been forwarded to Lords-Lieutenant, and in those nominations not a line, not a word, is put in to show that the petty sessional divisions which will be affected by them are in want of additional magistrates.

The political views of the nominees invariably coincide with the political opinions of the nominator, and in some cases I have found, after careful inquiry, that on grounds of physical incapacity, and even on personal grounds, some of these nominations are unreliable, and are, I suggest, therefore reckless and ill-considered. I have even been requested, in some cases almost peremptorily, to recommend persons for addition to the Commission of the Peace whom I could not honestly have justified myself in recommending had they been Conservatives or Unionists. I frankly state that I do not consider myself a mere conduit pipe to convey messages—I cannot call them recommendations—to the Lord Chancellor. I consider that I have a duty and a responsibility in satisfying myself as to the fitness and capacity of those whom I recommend to the noble and learned Lord. I recognise that in the last resort the responsibility lies with him to accept or reject the reasons which I may have placed before him for declining to forward any particular name or names, but I say that I have a duty to satisfy myself and to be able to guarantee the personal fitness of those whom I submit for his approval and assent.

The Marquess of Bath.

The plan of campaign is transparent. The Lords-Lieutenant are to be requested to forward lists of names to the noble and learned Lord, and if they decline to do so, they are to be denounced as partisans, and the Lord Chancellor is then to make his appointments over the heads of the Lords-Lieutenant and without any information to guide him. I ask your Lordships to consider what this means. In these days it not infrequently happens that the representative of a county division has no local connection with the constituency which he represents, and even in some cases has no residence in the county whose Benches he proposes to people and to control. When it is suggested that the Lords-Lieutenant are too much in the hands of the local Benches whom they consult, what must be the case with the nominations of those gentlemen who of necessity are entirely dependent on their political supporters and on political agents and wire-pullers for their sources of information?

The suggestions of partisanship on the part of Lords-Lieutenant, and that the political opinion of the magistrates prevents them from doing justice in the administration of the law, were repudiated both by the late Lord Herschell in this House and by Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has himself rejected the first insinuation in terms as gratifying as they are generous. The Lord Chancellor said—

> "It is bare justice I should say that, with rare exceptions, the Lords-Lieutenant with whom I have been in communication have acted and advised impartially and have taken much pains."

And again—

> "Without their help it would be impracticable to transact the business, and they have often warned against and so prevented most undesirable appointments."

I succeeded in the office which I have the honour to hold an eminent and a deservedly respected Member of your Lordships' House—the late Lord Cork. He was a keen Party man and was a Peer who followed Mr. Gladstone in his Irish policy. He was Lord-Lieutenant of Somerset for forty years, and it was stated in 1893 that the proportion of Liberal justices in that county was 20 per cent. I think the proportion now, of those I have nominated, is 34 per cent.

But, my Lords, is it suggested for a moment, to take one or two illustrations, that the late Lord Cork, or, may I say, the noble Marquess the respected Leader of this House, who was His Majesty's Lord-Lieutenant for the North Riding of Yorkshire for thirty-three years, and, I believe, succeeded a Liberal Peer who was appointed in 1838—is it suggested that those noble Lords have deliberately refrained from appointing to the Bench gentlemen of their own political views? I am perfectly certain that they acted with the greatest impartiality, that they based their recommendations on personal fitness irrespective of political opinions, and that they did not pass over their political friends because they were afraid of outside criticism. I am certain that no unworthy and no ulterior motives prompted their action, and the fact that the political complexion of the county Benches is largely of one hue is due to the accident of conditions and not to the design of responsible authorities. The suggestion that the vast disparity in the numbers of Conservative and Liberal justices is due to the long domination of the Conservative Party is proved, after impartial investigation and a study of the facts, to be without foundation.

There is another element to be considered besides merely the personal fitness of those recommended—namely, the requirements of the locality. I cannot help feeling that that consideration has been totally ignored by those who have bombarded us with their applications. After careful inquiry I find, so far as my own county is concerned, that most of the petty sessional benches are full, that some of them are even over-manned, and it is no exaggeration to say that if I were to succumb to all the demands made upon me room would have to be found for the overflow of magistrates, I presume, in the dock, and then we should have a demand made for further accommodation for the evicted tenants of that undesirable holding. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, I am glad to say, has not lost sight of that point, and he informed his correspondents that he was not prepared to flood the Benches, and that if he were to accede to all their demands there would be a regular deluge.

May I briefly refer to what occurred in 1893, because history only repeats itself? There was a deputation to the Lord Chancellor of the day, the late Lord Herschell, and then, as now, there was the complaint as to the partiality of Lords-Lieutenant, and even as to the partiality of the magistrates; there was complaint as to the undue proportion of political opinion on the Benches, and then, as now, the suggestion was made that the Lord Chancellor should appoint without the intervention of the Lords-Lieutenant. Lord Herchell, I think rather rashly, as he afterwards found, invited an expression of opinion from the then House of Commons to justify him in departing from immemorial practice, and a Resolution was passed. But I should be doing an injustice to the memory of that distinguished Member of this House if I did not draw your Lordships' attention to a part of his reply to the deputation. He said—

> "It would not do to take merely the recommendations of the representatives or the chairman of the Liberal association who sends the name to you, because it is not always necessarily those who are the most active politicians who would be the best for the magisterial bench."

In the month of June a Resolution was moved in this House by the Duke of Richmond to the following effect—

> "That it has been a long-established custom that the Justices of the Peace should be appoined in counties on the recommendation of the Lords-Lieutenant; and that in the opinion of this House it is highly inexpedient

to disturb this usage in any county for the purpose of placing on the Bench justices whose political opinions are in consonnance with those of the Government of the day."

Lord Herschell took part in that debate, and the Resolution was carried *nemine contradicente.* I trust that the terms of that Resolution commend themselves as emphatically to your Lordships to-day. With accurate foresight the late Lord Selborne pointed to the probability of the pressure of which I submit the Lord Chancellor is now the subject. He said—

> "I venture to say that there was no more difficult or unsatisfactory part of the duty of the Lord Chancellor in my time than that which related to the appointment of borough magistrates. There was constant pressure to obtain appointments for every reason except the fitness of the persons recommended for the performance of judicial duties, and most especially for political reasons. One manifest evil is the constant tendency to an undue increase in the number of magistrates. I am thoroughly convinced that there will be pressure brought to bear which the Lord Chancellor will find it most difficult, if not impossible, to resist, on party grounds, for making appointments which are not necessary to be made for the proper administration of justice, and which, when made, will not be conducive to the administration of justice."

Lord (then Mr.) Courtney, whom we welcome to this House, also expressed the same apprehension when he referred to—

> "An unconscious confession that in the minds of some there lurked the feeling that magistrates should be appointed, not on the grounds of personal fitness, but as the reward of political support. He was sure that the present Lord Chancellor, and he believed all Lords Chancellors, would beg protection against the pressure that would thus be put upon them."

The noble Duke (the Duke of Devonshire) referring in the same debate to his experience as a Lancashire representative, stated that pressure had been frequently brought to bear upon him to make appointments based solely and avowedly on political grounds, and simply as a reward for political services. Lord Herschell, in this debate—and it shows that he had considerably modified his views since he made his suggestion in March—said—

> "I admit at once that the transfer from the Lord-Lieutenant to the Lord Chancellor of the entire responsibility of manning the Bench would not be satisfactory. I am aware that the difficulty of the Lord-Lieutenant in a particular county is great in ascertaining whether the names presented are those of fit persons or not, but the difficulty of the Lord Chancellor in dealing with all the counties of England, Scotland, and Wales is infinitely greater. If, however, he has the assistance of those who know the county thoroughly in such a matter, there would be less liability of making mistakes. The Lord Chancellor would be perfectly mad if he relied entirely on wire-pullers and political agents. If I were to man the Bench solely on the recommendation of the politicians in counties I should make blunder after blunder."

Now, when the suggestion is made that there is dissatisfaction with the composition of the county magistracy, I ask, where is the evidence of any dissatisfaction and discontent with the administration of justice ? I am almost inclined to think that disappointed ambition and the consequent discontent of some local politicians have been magnified into conclusive evidence of the existence of discontent with the administration of justice.

But, my Lords, if there were any real, any widespread, any deep-seated or well-grounded dissatisfaction with the administration of justice, I submit that it would be found in the popular voice in the elections to local councils and boards, and not merely in the rumblings and grumblings of disappointed politicians. It is because I believe this agitation to be artificial and unreal that I have drawn the attention of the House to it this evening, and I venture to assert that to Americanise our system of administering justice by treating appointments to the magistracy as the legitimate spoil of political victors would be the last and the worst form of *dementia Americana.* It would open the door to methods of retaliation to which we are at present happily strangers.

Recommendations are one thing, and they are certainly not to be discountenanced. Solicitation is another, and should not be encouraged. But dictation is a third, and it becomes intolerable if it is not stoutly resisted. The principle which I have endeavoured to place before the House this evening may be summed up in sentence. It is this—that appointments a to the county benches should be made because the localities require them and not because politicians desire them ; and, further, that in the appiontment of magistrates men should be selected for their personal capacity and character, and not merely for their party zeal or political services. If I have been able at all to carry your Lordships with me in the principle I have endeavoured to give utterance to, I, at all events, shall feel that the trespass I have ventured to make on your Lordships' time is not wholly unpardonable.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): My Lords, probably it will be thought most convenient that I should address your Lordships immediately after the noble Marquess. Most of my colleagues will have to leave in a short time for the purpose of attending other important duties, and I therefore hope that if there should be anything said during the debate which I ought to answer, the House will be so indulgent as to allow me the favour of a few words at the conclusion.

I agree with the noble Marquess in one thing. I do not think that there is any foundation whatever for the idea, if such idea be current, that justice is not fairly administered in the main by the justices of the peace in this country. My belief is that they render a public service for which the country ought to be grateful to them; and in the whole of the time that I have been in my present place, although I have had complaints in regard to the vaccination laws, I have not received, and I believe that there has been really no ground for, any complaints in regard to the improper administration of justice by the magistrates of this country. It would be indeed a very ill thing on my part if I gave the slightest countenance to what I believe to be an unworthy aspersion.

Having said that, I pass to the main subject of the noble Marquess, and I think the simplest way is to begin by stating what it is that I want to see in regard to the bench of justices, and what is the policy in which my friends and colleagues, I believe, heartily concur. I attach the utmost importance to the office. Lord Bacon regarded the appointment of justices as being among the most important duties of the Lord Chancellor, and I think it is perfectly true. They have, in the first place, at the present day to administer the licensing laws—a matter of very great anxiety and difficulty; and, whether in their character of justices at petty sessions or at quarter sessions, or as grand jurymen, nearly all the criminal cases that there are in England and Wales come before them at one stage or another. And therefore I regard the office as one which ought not to be made a reward for political service, and as one which ought not to be distributed except because of the merit and claim of the person to be appointed. That is what I should like to see, and hope we may attain some day in this country.

I strongly object, of course, to anything like a monopoly of this office on the part of any Party in the State, or of any creed, or of those occupying any particular social *status*. It is a matter in which no one ought to look beyond the question, Is this person a person respected in his locality and likely to administer justice impartially, with knowledge, and with the sympathy of the population at large? Very well, I believe that will be the opinion of all of your Lordships, and I am bound to say that in the numerous communications that I have had with Lords-Lieutenant I have found that we do not really differ in our objects. I may add also that we have hardly ever differed in regard to the names of the justices who have been placed upon the Bench. The noble Marquess and myself have had more than one interview, and in the end I think we were agreed as to the names of those to be placed on the Bench. So it has been in regard to almost all the other Lords-Lieutenant with whom I have had the honour to communicate.

I wish to describe, simply and without offence, what we found was the case when we first came into office, and I think those who are acquainted with rural England will not dispute the truth of the description that I am going to give. For whatever reason—and I will say a word about the reason presently—there is no doubt that most of the magistrates in many of the counties of England belong to one political side. I am not attributing blame—I am going to speak of the cause presently; but that is a fact, and a fact that was admitted when we were discussing this subject last year. Also they were nearly all gentlemen of the same social *status*. They were not bad magistrates; they did their duty; but that was the description of their opinions and their social position.

Now, how did this come about? I do not in the least suggest, and I do not suppose that the noble Marquess thinks that I suggested, that this was done by any deliberate action or desire of the Lords-Lieutenant. I do not think so. On the contrary, I know that in many cases that I have discussed they have expressed a desire to find men of other than one particular creed and other than one particular class of opinion; but they stated (what I believe in many cases is perfectly true) that the difficulty is to find them, and that has undoubtedly been one factor. Also there was in existence, as we are aware, a law requiring a property qualification, which has been abolished. It is certainly the case that, by some freak of nature, those who are in better financial circumstances incline the more to the Conservative Party than they do unhappily to the Liberal Party, besides which there is this, the Lords-Lieutenant, of course, cannot know all the persons themselves individually, and they necessarily derive their information from other sources.

The Lord-Lieutenant himself is nearly always a person of great rank and distinction, and the petty rivalries and ambitions of his neighbourhood seem to him to be a fragment of the infinitely little. But it is not so among people of humbler degree who live in the locality and advise him. And I think the noble Marquess will admit this much, that the constant influence and the constant prepossession of the local Benches and their chairmen, and those others who have been in the habit of advising Lords-Lieutenant, has beyond doubt been unfavourable to one particular Party in the country, and has been biassed in favour of persons of a particular social *status*. I am not imputing malevolence. These things are all perfectly natural. It is not at all unnatural that those who have to choose, or to recommend, men who are to sit with them on the Bench should prefer people who move in the same circle, whom they know personally, whom they meet in the hunting field, the cricket field, or wherever else they seek their recreation. These things are not unnatural; but I say these influences have been permanent, and, although operating in a small way and in a small circle in each county, they have had a very great influence in producing the result which I have described.

I do not believe that it is the desire either of this House or of any other responsible body of men that there should be a sense of exclusion on the part of any of our countrymen, or that men should feel that the ways of honour and of distinction are closed to them in the neighbourhood where they live and like to be well regarded. It is not fair play, and it is not policy for this reason—that you ought to have, not merely the fact that justice is well administered in a district, but the general confidence of the community in the administration of justice, and a feeling that they or any of their class may, if they are worthy, be placed there to take part in administering justice.

There is no doubt at all that a very strong feeling has arisen and been existing for some time in reference to this subject. The noble Marquess thinks it is rather fictitious. I do not deny that there are fictitious elements in almost every agitation in this country upon every side in public life. We are all too familiar with the fictitious side of these things. But there is a genuine and a real side as well as a fictitious side; and I can assure the noble Marquess that if he had access—and for that matter he is heartily welcome to it—to the communications that come to me from different parts he would not think that it was merely the local wirepullers or the person fired with the ambition of being made a magistrate—a very curious ambition, I must say it often appears to me, for it is a most laborious duty if properly discharged—he would not think this feeling was confined to so narrow and so unworthy an element as that. There is, I can assure him, and there has been for some time a very real feeling that men who otherwise would be placed upon the Bench have been prevented from being so placed because of the partiality shown to Conservatives and to others in a particular social *status*. That is true. It may be exaggerated, if you will, but there is a very real and true feeling to that effect; and I certainly have had, and Lords-Lieutenant have remedied on my representation, repeated instances of men of very high standing who have been unaccountably passed over, not by the fault of the Lord-Lieutenant, as I have learned whenever I have made representation to him, but by reason of the influences and bias to which I have referred.

I admit in the fullest manner that there is another side to it. The noble Marquess has referred to a communication that I had to make to Members of the House of Commons last December. I stand by every word that I said, and I shall not be shaken, under any circumstances. But may I remind him of this? I said then—and it is perfectly true—that the great bulk of the communications that have been made to me by Members of Parliament have been of names, carefully prepared and thought over, honourably put forward by men who have as much repugnance as he or I have to the prostitution of the Bench of justices for any base purpose, but put forward really and truly because those who did not themselves want to be magistrates, but did wish to see fair play, felt that in their own locality something ought to be done to redress what was amiss. I must certainly say that I think the great bulk of those recommendations that have been made to me have been made in that spirit. I will not say that everyone knows, but I think it is the case that, whenever a new Government comes in, I do not care which side it is, there is apt to be an ugly rush for the purpose of getting some sort of political reward in the form of appointments to the Bench of justices. I do not want to say much about that, except that, if it has been complied with by some Chancellors, it will not be by me.

I have this feeling, that whatever may be said about the distribution of decorations, or titles, or other marks and badges of honour, under no circumstances ought any position of trust, as the position of a justice is, to be given to any person who is not quite fit for it in the opinion of those most competent to judge. Under these circumstances what have I done, what has the course been that I have adopted? What I have done in each case is, when any complaint or any representation was made in regard to the political complexion of the Bench that any persons were being excluded or had been excluded because of their opinions, or not equally treated, I have always forwarded anything that has been said to the Lords-Lieutenant, whenever I thought it was worthy of attention. There are many names and cases which I have not forwarded at all, because I did not think them to be worthy of attention.

I have no doubt the noble Marquess is perfectly right—in fact, I am sorry to say, from my own knowledge, that it is true—that some names sent forward in that way have not been the names of suitable persons. I am sure everyone will feel that it is impossible for me to be responsible for that being the case; but I can say that I have really tried to know, before sending these names forward, whether they were fit and worthy names. I have taken a good deal of pains to do that, and, when I have done so, I have met the Lords-Lieutenant. Our interviews have neither been long nor stormy. They have been, I think, always of a very pleasant character, and, with hardly any exception at all, the names that have been placed on the list have been placed with the concurrence of the Lords-Lieutenant. That has been the case with the noble Marquess, when certain names were placed on the list with the approval of the noble Marquess himself. So it is in the case of others. If, for example, a class of persons like workmen have not been placed on the Bench, or it was a case of the representatives of Roman Catholics not being admitted to the Bench, I have done exactly the same. I have communicated with the Lords-Lieutenant, and any remedy that has been applied has been applied with their approval, I believe almost without exception.

For my part, may I say that I think it is not a question of appointing simply on political considerations? I think you ought to get the best men, and see that no one is excluded either by reason of his political or religious opinions or by reason of his *status*; and I am glad to say that many working men, who have had the highest record, have been placed on different Benches in this country during the time I have had the honour of being Chancellor. That is what has been done; and now, having said that, I want to indicate, in one sense, concurrence with something that has been said by the noble Marquess.

I am not fully satisfied with the present working of the system of appointing magistrates. I have pointed out that a certain stream of information came to the Lords-Lieutenant, and that I thought that stream was charged with prepossession to a certain extent and with bias. A stream of information comes, also, to me, which is equally charged with prepossession and with bias. I do not think that that is a satisfactory condition of things on either side. I do not think it is desirable that a Lord-Lieutenant, with his great responsibility, should be dependent upon sources which are in any degree prejudiced, nor do I think it is desirable that I should be dependent upon such sources. I have thought a good deal as to whether it would be possible to make any suggestion by which, not during the tenure of office of one Government or of another, but permanently, some machinery should be set up by which we could get simply and solely the best men without hearing of the political side or the social side, by which an unbiassed choice should be made of the very best men for the purpose without the slighest regard to their opinions on any subject.

I have found it a matter of extreme difficulty to think out any such project. The other day I was sent a letter by a friend of mine written in the year 1745, from which it appeared that the great Lord Hardwicke, who was then Chancellor, had asked the Members for Norfolk their advice with regard to the appointment of magistrates, and they went to the assizes and consulted the grand jury as to what names they should send up to the Lord Chancellor in compliance with that request. I do not know whether the grand jury might be invoked, or whether, what would perhaps be more suitable, the county council might be asked to assist. I think it is most desirable that the ultimate responsibility should remain where it is, with the Lord Chancellor and the Lords-Lieutenant. and that they should themselves act cordially together in trying to get the best men under considerable difficulties. But I do not know whether it is possible. As I say, I really have not made up my mind, I cannot make up my mind definitely, on the subject of whether it is possible that a committee should be selected in each county, a committee of perfectly impartial men, with full local knowledge, who should be consulted in respect of all appointments that were to be made. Whether that is practicable or not, I really do not know; perhaps in the course of the debate some other plan may be suggested. If that course cannot be adopted, I can see nothing for it but to go on in the way in which we are going on now, and I hope that if we do we shall escape undue censure on any hand.

One other alteration which I should like to see, if possible, was referred to by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition last year. The noble Marquess asked whether anything could be done for the purpose of preventing gentlemen from continuing to hold the office of justice of the peace without discharging any of its duties. There is not the least doubt that a number of justices are merely nominal justices, and that they have no excuse for not discharging their duties. There are many of us in this House who, though we happen to be justices, have something else to do, and may well be excused, or at least hope for consideration, but if a man has nothing else to do, or has plenty of leisure, and systematically neglects to attend on the Bench, I think that I and the Lords-Lieutenant between us might arrange some method of asking such a person whether, in the interests of the county, he should not make place for someone who would discharge the duties. I agree with the noble Marquess that it would be most wrong to overman the Bench, and I have no intention of doing anything of the kind. But it is a different thing that gentlemen should remain justices or accept office when they have no intention of discharging the duties. I have stated what I have tried to do, and the spirit and object with which I have tried to do it; and I have also suggested the different amendments which do not require legislation, but which might be arranged between the Lords-Lieutenant and the Lord Chancellor. I hope this debate will be fruitful in suggestions by which these difficulties may be overcome.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the House is indebted to my noble friend for having been the means of inducing the noble and learned Lord to make the important statement to which we have just listened. It is a statement which I for one, and I think many of your Lordships must have listened to with the utmost satisfaction. That speech, following as it does the statement made by the noble and learned Lord last year, and following the remarkable letter published not long ago in *The Times* newspaper by the noble and learned Lord, seems to me to dispose once and for all of all the statements which have been freely made—statements in my belief entirely unfounded and unjustified—that these appointments to the Bench have in the past been usually given as the reward of political service; and it disposes also of the still more mischievous suggestion that, in order to redress the balance, future appointments should be made on the same grounds.

I gather from the noble and learned Lord's statement that he, at any rate, is satisfied that the manner in which the county magistrates of this country have administered justice has been satisfactory and beyond suspicion. I gather that he is determined that, for the future, appointments to the Bench will be made solely with reference to the merit and fitness of the individual concerned; that he is entirely opposed to the idea of flooding the county Benches with new magistrates in order to redress the disparity which now exists between the numbers in which the two political Parties are represented; and that, on the other hand, it is his desire that no person fit for one of these appointments should have the feeling that he is excluded on account of the particular political or religious tenets which he happens to observe. If that correctly represents the creed of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, I take leave to say that that is my creed also, and I believe the creed of every reasonable man in the country.

When I speak of selecting magistrates with reference to their fitness for a seat on the Bench, I ask myself what is it that we mean when we speak of a person being fit for magisterial work. In the first place, we intend that he shall be a person possessing, if I may use the words of the noble Lord in charge of last year's Bill, "education and intelligence." I do not suggest that a knowledge of the dead languages or anything of that kind is indispensable; but I do mean that a person should have that kind of education which, at any rate, will enable him to sift evidence in a reasonable manner, and to distinguish between statements based upon mere assertion and matters of proved fact.

What is the next qualification upon which we should insist? It is that the individual should occupy a position of independence. I do not mean independence in the sense of social rank or connection, but a position which places him beyond the reach or beyond the suspicion of improper influence. And that is the view of His Majesty's Government, because the House will remember that in the Act of last year there was a clause which made it illegal for a solicitor to sit upon the Bench before which he is in the habit of practising.

I think it is impossible to deny that in the past persons possessing qualifications of this kind have been more numerous and easier to find in the ranks of the Party represented on this side of the House than on the other side. That is a consequence which is inherent in the circumstances of the case; and in the past appointments to the Bench have been made, not because the individual has been a member of a particular Party, but because the particular attributes for which the Lords-Lieutenant and the Lord Chancellor had to look have been more usually found among persons possessing that territorial qualification of which we got rid last year. It was for that reason that I for one was ready to welcome the legislation of last year, because it seemed to me to extend the area within which the Lord-Lieutenant and the Lord Chancellor could look for suitable magistrates, and thereby break down what was, in appearance at any rate, the monopoly of one political Party.

I regret as much as the noble and learned Lord regrets that in the result it should prove to be the case that so enormous a preponderance of magistrates in some counties should be drawn from one political Party rather than the other. That is a political misfortune; but it would be a still greater misfortune if, in order to redress the disparity, incompetent persons were appointed recklessly and in a wholesale manner. But the declaration of the noble and learned Lord on that point appears to me entirely satisfactory, and I have not a word to say against it. I may say that the doctrine of the noble and learned Lord seemed to me more satisfactory than that propounded a few days ago by the Prime Minister in another place. The Prime Minister made a statement which, to those who read it, appeared to suggest that magistrates might be appointed as a reward, I will do him the justice to say, not of political service, but of local service, and with the object of redressing the inequality of which I spoke a moment ago.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I am sure the noble Marquess will understand that I should be the last man in England to say anything inconsistent with the declarations of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I am sure that if the noble Marquess reads the Prime Minister's statement carefully he will find that there was nothing inconsistent with what I have said.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: There may not have been a difference in intention, but there certainly is a difference in the manner in which the case was put. The Prime Minister used these words—

> "We are engaged in redressing the inequality of the present position of things."

My point is that that is not the object, or, at any rate, the main object, with which appointments should be made to the Bench; but that they should be made solely with regard to other considerations—first, whether the Bench stands in need of additional magistrates; and, secondly, whether the person put forward is in all respects a competent person. But I do not believe that, so far as the Lords-Lieutenants are concerned, there will be found to be any difference of opinion with regard to the principles on which we ought to proceed; and I for one should look forward, so long as these principles are observed, to there being not only no friction, but very loyal and useful co-operation between the Lords-Lieutenant and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack in the selection of magistrates. Whether it is possible that the machinery of selection can be permanently improved on the lines suggested by the noble and learned Lord, I do not like to say at this moment. I understood him to hint at the possibility of establishing a committee of what he described as perfectly impartial men to whom might be entrusted the duty of selecting these gentleman.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Advising.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am afraid there might be some initial difficulty in satisfying everybody of the strict impartiality of every one placed on that distinguished body. With regard to the other proposal, which I think the noble and learned Lord attributed to me, but the credit of which I cannot help thinking is due to my noble friend Lord St. Aldwyn—that a magistrate who habitually shirks his work and absents himself from the Bench should by some means or other be relieved of his duties—that seems to me an admirable suggestion, and if the noble and learned Lord carries the matter further, I believe he will receive a great deal of support.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE.

LORD LEITH OF FYVIE rose to move for any correspondence which had taken place between the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States of America respecting the international celebrations held at Pittsburg, United States of America, in connection with the opening of the Carnegie Institute; and to ask why His Majesty's Ambassador was not present or represented on that international occasion.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the Question I have placed upon the Paper requires an answer in some form, and I have no doubt it will be one which will remove the feeling that there has been indifference on the part of our Ambassador in America to affairs going on there. The institute to which I refer, the Carnegie Institute, has been growing for many years and is regarded by the people of the United States as a national institution. It is really the expression of an enormous evolution and development in the arts of iron and steel, especially in that centre of industry, Pittsburg, and therefore invitations were sent by the Committee to all nations to take part in the celebration of inauguration. Our Ambassador at Washington was invited, together with the representatives of all other foreign nations. His Majesty the Emperor William was not only represented by his Ambassador but he specially requested that a Commission, representing him, of the highest arts and sciences of his country, should be allowed to visit Pittsburg at the time and take part in the inauguration.

France, Italy, and other countries as well were represented by their highest minds in science and art, but in this international gathering England apparently was not represented. Our Ambassador declined the invitation, stating inability to attend, and he also declined on the part of the members of the Embassy to allow them to attend a meeting at which the representatives of all nations were taking part in doing honour to a very great evolution—a world evolution. England alone stood aloof in the inauguration of this institute. Those who have worked in the United States and in connection with the people of America are aware how sensitive they are, and how often it is that little things of this kind affect the public mind and grow from an acorn into an enormous tree of public opinion.

It will be a great disappointment to those who have been connected with the United States if they see that the great work done by the patient endeavours of the late Lord Pauncefote in establishing the *entente* between the two countries is in any way endangered by an act of indifference which might be construed into something rather stronger; and I think it is desirable that the matter should be met at once and the American people told that there was no intention of any indifference. Our own people were represented largely by the Colonies and representatives of arts and letters, but when it came to the question of the Government, England was silent. Surely England should have taken the lead in a matter of this kind to congratulate the country on this great institution which constitutes an immense development of the technical and scientific education of the nation.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for any correspondence which has taken place between the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States of America respecting the international celebrations held at Pittsburg, United States of America, in connection with the opening of the Carnegie Institute.—(*Lord Leith of Fyvie.*)

LORD FITZMAURICE: My Lords, there is no correspondence which, in the opinion of the Foreign Office, could be usefully laid respecting the celebrations held at Pittsburg in connection with the opening of the Carnegie Institute. I hope, however, that I shall be able to give a reply which will be satisfactory to the noble Lord. I make no complaint of his asking the Question. On the contrary, statements have been made in the Press in regard to this gathering which, if uncontradicted, might possibly leave a mistaken impression. I therefore think it desirable that they should be contradicted, and I am grateful to the noble Lord for having given me this opportunity of doing so.

I wish, in the first place, to say that the invitations which were issued to the heads of foreign Missions, were not issued to them as such, or in any official capacity. I have been in communication with His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington since the noble Lord placed his Question on the Paper, and the statement I am making is based on information received from him. His Majesty's Ambassador had only just returned from an official visit to Canada, and had important business to transact at Washington, which made it impossible for him to absent himself again so soon, especially as he was due to attend the National Arbitration and Peace Congress Conference at New York and a conference at Philadelphia during the following week. It was, as I have said, impossible for Mr. Bryce to attend the opening of the Carnegie Institute owing to the multifarious character of the duties which awaited him immediately on his arrival at Washington from Canada, whither he had gone for high reasons of State, and he selected those engagements which he could attend with the greatest facility consistently with the discharge of his other duties at Washington. Neither the German, Austro-

Hungarian, French nor Russian Embassies were represented at Pittsburg; therefore there was nothing in the absence of Mr. Bryce to call attention in any marked way by contrast to any discrepancy between the position of the British Embassy and the Embassies I have mentioned. There were important representatives of those great interests, educational and other, to which the Pittsburg Institute so much appeals in the presence at the celebrations of delegates from our great and ancient Universities as well our more modern Universities, and I believe the Government of the United States and the people of America fully recognised in the presence of those deputations the outward sign of the respect and sympathy which the Government and people of this country felt in that great gathering and the proceedings connected with it. If there has been any misunderstanding such as the noble Lord seems to think has arisen, I am exceedingly glad of the opportunity publicly to state how much His Majesty's Government and our Ambassador at Washington appreciated the importance of that occasion, and how much Mr. Bryce himself regretted that he was prevented from attending; and I need not remind the House that there is hardly any man in the whole of our diplomatic service to whom a great educational occasion of this kind would appeal more than to Mr. Bryce.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 22nd April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]; Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords]; Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Central London Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH.

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

Medway Lower Navigation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Royal Insurance Company Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords] [not amended].—Considered; to be read the third time.

Manchester Ship Canal (Various Powers Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act for conferring further powers on the Tyne Improvement Commissioners; and for amending certain of the Tyne Improvement Acts, 1850 to 1902; and for other purposes." [Tyne Improvement Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to vest the existing tramways in the City of Oxford in the City of Oxford Electric Tramways, Limited, and to authorise that company to remove and reconstruct the same, and to construct additional tramways in and adjacent to the city; and for other purposes." [Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords].

Tyne Improvement Bill [Lords]; Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BARMAIDS' RESTRICTION OF EMPLOYMENT.

Petition from Kilmarnock, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Pontyberem, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

GROCER'S LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Crail, Anstruther, and District, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Banff; Banffshire; Crail; Kilwinning; and Lieth, to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Aberfeldy; Alexandria; Alyth; Auchinlech (two); Auchterarder; Birsay and Harray; Bonar Bridge; Bo'ness (two); Burnbank; Cadezow Castle; Cambusbarron; Cambusnethan; Coatbridge; Denny; Dumbarton; Falkirk; Fordyce; Galston; Gamrie and Macduff; Girvan; Glasgow (six); Greenock; Hamilton; Kilsyth; Kirkintilloch; Kirkwynd; Leith (two); Muirkirk (two); Musselburgh; Port Glasgow (two); Riccarton; St. Margaret's Hope; St. Quivox; Saltcoats; Sandbank; and Uphall; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from Kilmarnock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.

Return [presented 19th April], to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 116.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Glamorgan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of shops within the Aber, Town, and Ystrad Mynach Wards of the Caerphilly Urban District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of Aberdeen for 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 117.]

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Account presented, of the Gross Public income and Expenditure in the year ended 31st March, 1907, together with the balances in the Exchequer at the commencement and at the termination of the year, and the amounts received into or issued from the Exchequer in respect of Funded and Unfunded Debt created or redeemed in the said year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 118.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Reports of the Local Education Authority and of His Majesty's Inspector upon the educational fitness of Mr. Milnes for the position of head teacher of the Royston National School, in the West Riding of Yorkshire [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 10th April; Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 119.]

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities; County of Wiltshire). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901; *Mr. Griffith Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 120.]

Inquiry into Charities (County of Berkshire). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 121.]

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Devon). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 26th July, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 122.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Alleged Dissatisfaction amongst Irish National School Inspectors.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction amongst inspectors of national schools in Ireland, because they are constantly harassed by letters from the Education Office, to which many of them had to write strongly in reply, while others had to travel long distances from the country to Dublin to remonstrate in person against such treatment, and some are afraid to give expression to their feelings on the matter for fear of penalties involved; whether these letters are the productions of clerks and others utterly ignorant of inspection work; whether any of the twenty Commissioners, except Dr. Starkie, can be sufficiently intimate with the working of the Education Office to know anything about the justice of any fine or censure imposed; and whether, seeing complaints or protests only lead to further punishment which, owing to the ignorance of the inner working of the office on the part of nearly all the Commissioners, can be inflicted with impunity, he will appoint a small committee to inquire into the working of the National Education Office.

[The following Answer to be substituted for that printed in the *Debates* for Friday, 19th April, cols. 1260–1.]

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they are not aware that dissatisfaction exists amongst their inspectors generally. Certain inspectors have been guilty of irregularities and have performed their duties in an unsatisfactory manner, and have consequently incurred official censure. This censure was not imposed until the cases had been very fully investigated by the chief or senior inspectors and the facts placed before the resident Commissioner or the Board. Two of the inspectors concerned were summoned before a special committee meeting of the Commissioners, and were afforded full opportunity of answering the charges brought against them. The Commissioners individually are kept fully informed of all the business of the office, and no serious punishment is inflicted on any officers without their authority. The maintenance of discipline among the staff is a matter which falls within the province of the Commissioners themselves, and no facts have been brought to my notice which would appear to call for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the matter.

Condition of Irish Land Purchase Guarantee Fund.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the present condition of the Guarantee Fund under the Irish Land Purchase Acts, showing the amount drawn to make good defaults under the Act of 1903, the amounts withheld from several counties and from the whole of Ireland out of the normal Probate Duty and agricultural grants, which must now be added to local rates; is the Treasury aware that in this way people, not parties to the purchase transactions, are contributing to the payment of prices; and can he find in the practice of the Treasury any precedent or analogy for the present system of land purchase.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The following Statement shows the net amounts drawn under the Land Purchase Act of 1903 from the Guarantee Fund for each county and the whole of Ireland, for the period from the commencement at 1st November, 1903, to 31st January, 1907:—

County.	Net amount drawn in respect of		Total.
	Arrears of Annuities.	Insufficiency of Income.	
	£	£	£
Antrim - - -	13	1,118	1,131
Armagh - - -	70	1,293	1,363
Carlow - - -	138	1,330	1,468
Cavan - - - -	44	154	198
Clare - - - -	164	435	599
Cork - - - -	831	4,050	4,881
Donegal - - -	44	643	687
Down - - - -	119	2,114	2,233
Dublin - - -	325	1,271	1,596

County.	Net amount drawn in respect of.		Total.
	Arrears of Annuities.	Insufficiency of Income.	
	£	£	£
Fermanagh - - -	92	1,328	1,420
Galway - - -	304	3,321	3,625
Kerry - - - -	130	632	762
Kildare - - -	944	7,714	8,658
Kilkenny - - -	701	4,045	4,746
King's - - - -	321	1,077	1,398
Leitrim - - -	97	252	349
Limerick - - -	1,168	3,017	4,185
Londonderry - -	66	1,296	1,362
Longford - - -	145	1,014	1,159
Louth - - - -	60	301	361
Mayo - - - -	64	2,024	2,088
Meath - - - -	196	3,733	3,929
Monaghan - - -	128	419	547
Queen's - - -	164	1,332	1,496
Roscommon - - -	702	4,104	4,806
Sligo - - - -	62	1,271	1,333
Tipperary, North -	336	768	1,104
„ South -	502	2,097	2,599
Tyrone - - -	290	1,925	2,215
Waterford - - -	280	670	950
Westmeath - - -	262	1,961	2,223
Wexford - - -	200	2,262	2,462
Wicklow - - -	157	2,906	3,063
	9,119	61,877	70,996

As regards the allocation of the sums so drawn between the Death Duty Grant and the Agricultural Grant, the hon. Member is referred to the Answer given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary on the 16th instant;[†] but I should point out that the figures given by him include sums drawn under previous Land Acts as well as under the Act of 1903. In the last part of the Question the hon. Member is criticising the policy of the Act of 1903 which the Treasury has no power to alter.

Liverpool Post Office Medical Officer.

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the suggestion that the telegraph staff residing in the Birkenhead area of Liverpool are dissatisfied with their treatment by the local medical officer, and that in consequence a number have recourse to other medica officers; and whether he will cause inquiries to be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No suggestion of the kind has reached me; but I will make inquiry.

Non-Delivery of Letters on Early Closing Days.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will inform the House of the number and names of towns where the delivery of letters in the afternoon of the early closing days of the respective districts does not take place; and whether he will consider the desirability of extending the system of non-delivery in the afternoon of the early closing days.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). The information asked for by the hon. Member is not readily available; but I may say that it is already usual, in all cases where the circumstances admit and the local authorities are in favour of such a course, to make some arrangement of the kind described on early closing days.

Appointment of Volunteer Adjutants.

MR. FIENNES (Oxfordshire, Banbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the better standard of efficiency that has been attained by the Yeomanry and Volunteers is due to the circumstance that the adjutants since the War in South Africa have been more carefully selected, better qualified, and more up to date than previously, he will consider the desirability of not making any alteration in the system.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of the appointment of adjutants to the Territorial Force is one of considerable importance, and many representations on the subject have been forwarded for my consideration. The whole matter is under close consideration by the general staff, and I am not in a position at the present moment to make any definite statement as to what course ought to be adopted.

Strength of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers—War Service.

MR. FIENNES: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the strength of the Militia, Volunteers, and Yeomanry at the date they were called upon for special service in South Africa; and what percentage from each of these branches of the Auxiliary Forces actually served in the War.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*). The enrolled strengths were as follows:—

Militia, on 1st October, 1899 -	98,050
Yeomanry, at date of inspection, July or August, 1899 -	9,947
Volunteers, on 1st November, 1899 - - - -	222,584

The following numbers actually went to South Africa:—

Militia - - - - -	45,566
Yeomanry - - - - -	2,789
Volunteers (includes those who joined the C.I.V., Volunteer Service Companies, and Imperial Yeomanry) -	26,065

5,922 Militia also went to Malta, Egypt, and St. Helena during the war.

Meat Inspection in Scotland.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the fact that where local authorities in Scotland carry out the Public Health Act of 1897 dealing with meat inspection, consignors of live pigs and pig carcases, rather than run the risk of condemnation by these local authorities, forward their live stock to the surrounding districts, where the authorities are less stringent, whence they find their way in the form of cured hams into the proscribed localities; whether he is aware that this is a disadvantage to those who seek to carry out the law; and whether he will insist on equality of standard of meat inspection for all local authorities.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 749-52.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The attention of the Board has been called to this practice, and they have instructed inquiry to be made into it.

Mr. WATT: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the inquiry into the methods of meat inspection by the officers of local authorities in Scotland has now been completed; and if he will report the results of that inquiry.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) As I have already informed my hon. friend, the inquiry will shortly be completed. The question of communicating the result of the inquiry will receive my careful consideration.

Infants and Children in Public Houses.

Mr. FIENNES: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has yet obtained any reports on the subject of women taking their infants and young children to the public houses in London and other large towns; and, if so, whether he can lay them upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have received some reports on this subject and I am asking for further information in connection with them. When I have received it I will communicate with my hon. friend.

Financial Deficiencies in Working of Irish Land Act.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if his attention has been called to the stoppages which have been made out of certain grants payable to County Councils in Ireland to meet alleged financial deficiencies in the working of the Irish Land Act of 1903; can he state how these deficiencies have arisen; if he is aware that, if the Treasury persist in their present action, it will have the effect of dislocating local government all over Ireland and also have a most injurious effect on the progress of land purchase in Ireland; and will he publish the rules under which the Treasury have acted in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Under Section 29 (2) of the Irish Land Act, 1903, the Guarantee Fund is liable to make good any deficiency on the Income Account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund. So far as these deficiencies are caused by the issue of guaranteed stock at a discount, the Ireland Development Grant, as one of the constituent parts of the Guarantee Fund, is the first to be charged under Section 38; so that no charge for deficiencies arising from that cause can fall on the Local Taxation Grants so long as the Ireland Development Grant is able to meet them. But there are other deficiencies on the Income Account with which the Local Taxation Grants, as constituents of the Guarantee Fund, are directly chargeable, and I fear there is no possibility of avoiding the occurrence of such deficiencies when advances at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. interest are provided for by the public issue of stock bearing the same rate of interest, and no margin is allowed between the rate of interest payable and the rate of interest receivable to cover incidental losses. These losses arise from the following causes:—

(1) Arrears of payment of the purchase annuities;

(2) The system of issuing stock entitled to a half-year's dividend on the first following dividend day, although the subscribers to the stock are allowed to pay up their subscription by instalments which may extend up to, or even beyond, that dividend day. It is clear that, when the National Debt Commissioners have to pay a half-year's dividend on a certain day, and have not had the use of the money for a full six months before that day, a deficiency must result;

(3) The gale day on which the purchase annuities are payable is in each case one month earlier than the

dividend day. This interval is necessary to enable the annuities to be collected and paid over to the National Debt Commissioners before the dividend day. But the result is that the payment received from a tenant on his first gale day includes interest for one month less than the period in respect of which dividend is payable on the stock;

(4) The capital of the Land Purchase Fund, so far as not required for advances, is temporarily invested by the National Debt Commissioners in securities. The interest on these securities is received on varying dates, and at the date when the balance of the Income Account must be struck there is always a temporary deficiency due to the fact that a certain amount of interest which has accrued has not yet been received into the account;

(5) On large transactions, such as those of the Land Purchase Fund, it is impossible to have the whole of the capital moneys invested and earning interest on every day of the year. There must always, therefore, be a loss of income from unproductive balances.

A careful analysis of the charge of £70,996 which has been made upon the Local Taxation Grants shows it to be attributable to these five causes in the following proportions:—

	£
(1) Arrears of annuities - -	9,119
(2) Unearned dividend on issues of stock - - - -	23,750
(3) Advance dividend - -	13,650
(4) Interest due but not received -	15,500
(5) Unproductive balances - -	8,977
	£70,996

The arrears of purchase annuities are for the most part temporary. I understand that since the account was made up on 31st January last a sum of £4,046 has been recovered on account of the £9,119 then in arrear. The chief item of charge is the unearned dividend of £23,750 arising out of the mode of issue of the stock, which is required by custom and the convenience of the City. It is open to question whether this charge could not properly be treated as a capital charge to be paid for by annuity out of the Development Grant. But an amendment of the Act would be necessary to enable this to be done, as the Act at present requires (Section 29) (1), that the dividends on the stock shall be paid out of the income of the fund. The advance dividend charge will not be made good until the purchase annuities are completed, many years hence. A further charge of the same kind must arise on every issue of the stock. The deficiency of income which arises from unproductive balances is an inevitable and a permanent loss. The only charges which are of a temporary nature are those relating to arrears and to interest accrued but not received. After analysing and reviewing all the charges, I have come to the conclusion that it should be possible to avoid charging the Local Taxation Grants in full for those items by making use of the working balance which was rendered available by the Labourers Act of last Session, and I propose to have the Treasury Rules amended to enable this to be done. I may add that the Treasury Rules were published in House of Commons Paper, No. 151, of 1905.

Weight of Metal in Ships.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if any method exists by which the total weight of metal on a ship can be arrived at; and, if so, whether steps will be taken to find out such weight before any of His Majesty's ships are sold to be broken up.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The only way of arriving at the total weight of metal on a ship would be to refer to the records of the weighing-in of the ship of her class selected for weighing at the time of the building, due allowance being made for non-metallic materials and for weights withdrawn or added in her subsequent history. The calculation would be rather elaborate and the result approximate only and not commensurate with the labour involved. It is, therefore, not proposed to adopt the course suggested by the noble Lord.

House of Commons Newspaper Reading Room.

Mr. WATT: To ask the First Commissioner of Works if he can see his way to provide a new newspaper reading room, so that Members may not be forced to read the daily papers in a thoroughfare.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I have not at present been able to discover any other suitable room, but I should welcome suggestions from Members.

Bombay Municipal Elections.

Mr. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, with reference to the recent Bombay municipal elections and the public meeting of protest held in Bombay regarding them on 7th April, he will consider the advisability of suggesting to the Indian Government that in future officers of Government should not be allowed to offer themselves as candidates for election on municipalities and district boards, especially as the Government has the right of nominating an adequate number of members to represent them on such bodies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) As at present advised, I am not prepared to lay down a general rule such may hon. friend suggests.

The Colonial Conference and Treatment of British Indians in the Colonies.

Mr. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has instructed the representative of India at the Colonial Conference to raise the question of the treatment of His Majesty's Indian subjects in self-governing British Colonies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The question will certainly be discussed with the representatives of the Colonies, but whether in full conference, or in what other form, I cannot at present say.

Deaths from Plague in India.

Dr. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Secretary of State for India how many deaths have occurred in India from plague since the outbreak in 1896; how many deaths from plague have been reported for each week during this year, 1907; and which provinces are the most affected.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The recorded deaths from plague in India, including Native States, from September, 1896, to end of March, 1907, are approximately 5,012,000. The monthly Returns which I receive from India show 58,438 deaths in January, 98,397 deaths in February, 171,522 deaths in March of the present year. I hope that the hon. Member will be satisfied with monthly totals. The provinces most affected are the United Provinces, the Punjab, Bengal, and Bombay.

Indian Medical Service.

Dr. RUTHERFORD: To ask the Secretary of State for India what is the number of officers of the Indian medical service now on duty in India, exclusive of those attached to regiments; and what is the number of medical officers especially deported for plague work, exclusive of civil surgeons and officers in other medical work.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Government of India will be asked for the Return. I will lay it when received upon the Table.

English Medical Men Engaged on Indian Plague Work.

Dr. RUTHERFORD: To ask the Secretary of State for India how many medical men from England from time to time have been engaged by the Secretary of State for plague work in India; and how many of those medical men are now on special plague duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I will ask the Government of India to have the Return prepared, and will lay it upon the Table when I receive it.

Plague Precautions in India.

Dr. RUTHERFORD: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the recommendations to the Indian Government by Professor Simpson, late medical officer of health to Calcutta, to introduce a special sanitary service composed of Indian medical men and women supervised by European experts, and repeated in his work on plague, have been carried out to stay and prevent the ravages of plague.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I would refer my hon. friend to the published Resolution of the Government of India, dated 8th September, 1904, creating the office of Sanitary Commissioner, in which is described the action taken by them in various schemes for the constitution of a separate sanitary service, and the difficulties, financial and administrative, in the way of an effective and speedy reorganisation. Much has been done to strengthen and improve the existing sanitary agency at the disposal of local governments, especially in districts where plague is liable to occur. The subject is still engaging the anxious consideration of the Government.

Arrears of Tenant Purchasers' Annuities Chargeable to County Kildare.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the amount (if any) chargeable to the county of Kildare in respect of net advances made by the Guarantee Fund after deducting repayments out of current instalments of annuities in the years ended the 12th day of February, 1906 and 1907, respectively; what is the amount certified for chargeable to the same county and drawn from the Guarantee Fund in respect of purchasers' half-yearly payments in arrear, and the amount of repayments to Guarantee Fund of such arrears recovered for the year ending the 31st January, 1907, the amount certified for in respect of insufficiency of income chargeable to the same county and drawn from the Guarantee Fund under Section 29 of the Irish Land Act, 1903; will he state the terms of the rule under which a county, not in arrear in its payments, may be made liable for dividends in respect of sales of land in other counties, and how the grants in aid of local taxation in counties not in arrear are made applicable to the purposes of the Guarantee Fund.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The net amount chargeable to county Kildare in respect of arrears of tenant purchasers' annuities was £1,695 18s. 3d. in 1905–6, but in 1906–7 the repayments exceeded the arrears by £928 7s. 9d., viz., arrears drawn from Guarantee Fund £1,780 5s. 4d. and arrears recovered £2,708 13s. 1d. The net amount charged to the same county under section 29 (2) of the Act of 1903 in respect of deficiency of income has been £7,714 12s. 8d. The certificates of the amounts chargeable to the several counties are prepared under Rule 10 (2) of Treasury Rules and Regulations, dated 14th April, 1905, published in House of Commons, Paper No. 151, of 1905.

The Ballingeary Disturbances—Action of Mr. O'Hara, Resident Magistrate.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, when issuing warrants for the arrest of some parties charged with offences arising out of the Ballingeary disturbances, Mr. O'Hara, resident magistrate for the Macroom district, framed the warrants in such a fashion that the persons against whom they were issued should, when arrested, be brought before himself and no other; will he say if it is the usual practice for resident magistrates to exercise a power of this kind; and will he offer any explanation of the course adopted by Mr. O'Hara, which reflected on the character and impartiality of the ordinary justices of the peace.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. The warrants were issued on 6th October last. The resident magistrate acted within his powers as a justice of the peace in directing, in the warrants, that the persons against whom they were issued should be brought before himself. The adoption of such a course by Mr. O'Hara or any other justice of the peace does not reflect upon the impartiality of other magistrates.

Extra Police in County Clare.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any extra force of police has recently been drafted into the district around Confin and Kilnaboy, county Clare; and, if so, can he state the strength of the force and the reason they were sent to that part of the county; and whether he is aware that threatening notices were recently posted up in this neighbourhood.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) An extra force of twelve policemen has recently been drafted into the district referred to in order to provide for the preservation of the peace. The police have reported that threatening notices have recently been posted up in the locality.

Division of Untenanted Land on the Colonel Westropp, Doonas, Estate.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners got 170 acres of untenanted land on the Colonel Westropp, Doonas, estate to divide among the tenants of that estate having small holdings, and how long is it since they got the division of this land; whether, whilst they intended to make seventeen divisions, they will consider the desirability of increasing the number of divisions so that a greater number of the poorer tenants would get a division; and will he say when is the division to take place, as there is a question of getting additional untenanted land in the neighbourhood which would be already obtained but for the delay in the division of this land.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that in this case 175 acres of untenanted land are being sold to them. The Commissioners specially expedited the inspection, and have since had the land divided into seventeen parcels for distribution. Steps are at present being taken to obtain the signatures to purchase agreements of the seventeen persons selected as purchasers, and as soon as this has been done the purchasers will be put into possession. The Commissioners consider that the division of the lands which they have made is the most suitable in the circumstances, and cannot now re-open the matter.

Increase of Salary for Staff of Dublin Botanical Gardens.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the labourers, gardeners, and general staff of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Glasnevin, Dublin, may expect to get the small increase of salary which they recently applied for; and when they may expect to get off on Saturdays at one o'clock, the same as at the Royal Gardens, Kew, and other places.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The scale of remuneration of the general staff of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Glasnevin, has recently been revised, and increases of pay have been sanctioned in certain cases. The new arrangements will take effect as from the first instant, but increments on the new scales will not be allowable until the expiration of one year from that date. It has also been arranged to grant a Saturday half-holiday to such of the staff as can be spared without inconvenience.

Irish Poor Rates—Disfranchisement for Non-Payment.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a number of Parliamentary and Local Government Board electors are annually disfranchised by reason of the non-payment of poor rates within the statutory period for payment; whether he is aware that the poor rate is now annually struck by the county council about the month of May in each year, and that such rate, in order to qualify for the franchise, must be paid on or before the 1st July of the following year, and that the collectors of poor rate under the Orders made by the Local Government Board must now lodge the full amounts of the rates within fixed periods; whether the disfranchisement referred to arises from the fact that the rate collectors in numerous cases fail to require payment from the occupiers until after the time has lapsed, in other words, until after the 1st July of the following year; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of the Order of the Local Government Board requiring that the rate collectors should finally close their accounts and proceed for all recoverable rates before the next rate is made, in order that the ratepayers concerned should not be disqualified by the action of the rate collector.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have no information as to the first part of the Question. The poor rate is now usually struck in the months of April and May, and the latest date for paying the rate, in order to be qualified for the franchise, is the 1st July of the following year. The ratepayer has, therefore, over a year in which to pay his rates before he can be disfranchised. One poor rate is made for the whole of the year, but this may be collected in two moieties. Under the Public Bodies Order the poor rate collectors are required to close their collections at the end of each half-year, namely, on 30th September and 31st March. It is the practice of county councils to insist that the poor rate collectors shall close the year's collection on 31st March in each year, and in order to be able to lodge the full amount of their warrants at that date it is necessary that every effort should be made by the collectors by means of summons and distress to collect the rate from the occupiers. Provision is made under the Public Bodies Order for refunding to collectors under prescribed conditions the amount of rates which they have failed to recover for sufficient reason. The latter recoverable rates are carried forward to the next year's collection for recovery as arrears with the first moiety of the current year. It therefore follows that if the county and urban district councils comply with the prescribed requirements the rate collectors should have no difficulty in sending out the demands in the month of May, in which case persons in arrears have ample time to pay the rates in time to prevent disfranchisement. As a matter of fact less than one per cent. of the rate is carried forward in each year. In the circumstances a new Order, such as is suggested in the Question, appears to be unnecessary.

Deduction from Grant to County Sligo in Respect of Land Purchase.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a sum of £1,506 19s. 7d. has been deducted, in respect of land purchase, from grants payable to the county council of Sligo in the month of March, 1907; and can he state what loss, if any, will be sustained by the urban district council of Sligo in consequence of this deduction.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The amount deducted in the case of county Sligo is correctly stated in the Question. A sum of £66 17s. 5d. has been deducted directly from the share of the Sligo urban district. In addition the ratepayers in the urban district will have to make good about £79, as part of the deduction made from the share of the guardians of the Sligo Union.

Building of New Schoolhouse at Gortnacart.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the fact that upwards of seven years ago, at the instance of the late Reverend Peter Kelly, P.P., the manager of the national school, Gortnacart, county Donegal, a grant was sanctioned for the building of a new schoolhouse, but that the Commissioners, owing to want of money, induced Father Kelly to await the settlement of the question of the plans and estimates for schoolhouses, now that the Treasury has consented to make a grant of £40,000 for three years for the purpose of repairing and building schools, steps will be taken to secure that the building of a new schoolhouse at Gortnacart, owing to the priority and urgency of the claim, and the report of every inspector of the unsatisfactory and insanitary condition of the present temporary schoolhouse, be forthwith undertaken and speedily brought to completion.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education are desirous that steps should at once be taken to provide new premises for the Gortnacart national school; and, as the new standard plans and specifications for national school buildings, though agreed upon in principle, will not be ready for some time, the Commissioners propose to invite the manager to submit special plans in this case.

Arrests at Athenry—Legal Aid for Accused.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what time elapsed between arrest and sentence of men arrested at Athenry, county Galway, upon the 5th inst.; were they afforded an opportunity of being legally represented at the trial; where did it take place; and were the public admitted to same.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The persons referred to were separately arrested on 5th instant at times varying from 10.45 a.m. till 12.30 p.m. Three of the arrests were made in Athenry Fair. The men were taken before the resident magistrate at 12.45 p.m. at the Athenry police station, where the hearing took place. I am informed that the accused persons did not express any desire to be legally represented and that the public did not seek to be admitted to the hearing of the case.

Kerry County Council and Sir C. Cameron, Public Analyst.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Kerry County Council have notified Sir C. Cameron that they do not require his services further as public analyst; that they did so only after they had been put to considerable inconvenience and expense by inaccurate analyses made by him; whether similar complaints have been made in Waterford and Wexford; and whether, under those circumstances, the Local Government Board will refuse the request of the council; and, if so, will they (the Local Government Board) pay the cost of all prosecutions which fail because of incorrect analysis.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The complaint made by the county council against Sir Charles Cameron had reference to an unsuccessful prosecution for depriving milk of its fats. It appears that Sir Charles Cameron's certificate differed from those of Somerset House and of the Cork analyst. Sir Charles Cameron states that the milk was analysed twice with great care, that it was partially decomposed when he received it, and that as there was an excess of fat in the sample sent to Somerset House there may have been separation of the milk constituents when the sample was taken. A somewhat similar case arose last year in county Wexford. The Local Government Board have no record of a similar case in county Waterford. A public analyst cannot be removed without the approval of the Local Government Board; and the Board have informed the county council that no sufficient grounds have been advanced to warrant the dismissal of Sir Charles Cameron from his position as public analyst for the county. The reply to the concluding portion of the Question is in the negative.

Sale of the Morrogh Bernard Estate.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the sale of the Morrogh Bernard Estate, county Kerry, will be sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners until all the evicted tenants on it are reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Before sanctioning advances for the purchase of the estate mentioned, the Estates Commissioners will fully investigate the cases of all evicted tenants who seek reinstatement upon it, and will endeavour to arrange for the restoration of such as are qualified.

Conversion of 15-Pounder Field Guns.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the conversion of the 15-pounder field gun with which it is proposed to arm the Territorial Army has in any way affected the ballistics of the gun.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The reply is in the negative.

Militia Officers and the New Reserve of Officers.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether Militia officers will be able to join the new reserve of officers recommended by Sir E. Ward's Committee; and, if so, what their training and remuneration will be, and whether they will retain their existing rank.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The recommendations of Sir E. Ward's Committee are still under consideration, and at present it is impossible to say what terms will be offered to the new Reserve officers, or what amount of training they will receive. When the new Reserve is formed, Militia officers wishing to join it will be able to do so in their present rank, provided they are within the limit of age laid down for Reserve officers.

Duke of York's School—Accommodation at Chelsea and Dover—Disposal of Site.

Mr. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many boys are now accommodated at the Duke of York's School, Chelsea, and how many will be provided for at the new school at Dover; when it is expected that the transference will take place; is it proposed to develop the land for building purposes, and has any scheme been prepared; and, if so, does it include any open space or garden which will be available for public use; and, should there be a balance of profit on the sale of the buildings and land after erecting the new school, to what object will the proceeds be devoted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) 550 boys are now accommodated at the school at Chelsea, and 480 boys will be provided for in the new school. The Queen Victoria Memorial School in Scotland will provide additional accommodation for 275 sons of sailors and soldiers. It is hoped that the buildings will be ready before the end of 1908. As regards the other points raised in the Question no decision has yet been reached in regard to the disposal of the site of the present school.

Young Men's Christian Association and the Wilts and Gloucester Volunteer Infantry Brigade Camp.

Mr. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the Brigadier-General commanding the Wilts and Gloucester Volunteer Infantry Brigade has refused permission to the Young Men's Christian Association to erect a recreation tent in the camp this year at Lulworth, although permission has always been given in the past; and, if so, whether he is prepared to ask the Brigadier-General to reconsider his decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Nothing is known of this matter at the War Office, and the question has been referred to the local military authorities.

Deaths due to Violence in Macedonia.

Mr. LYNCH: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the number of violent deaths which occurred in the three vilayets of Macedonia for the periods from the 1st October, 1905, to the end of February, 1906, and from the 1st October, 1906, till the end of February, 1907; and whether he will obtain statistics showing the number of deaths due to violence in these vilayets for each month for the years 1905, 1906, and for the expired portion of 1907.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) His Majesty's Government have no complete records of the numbers of violent deaths in Macedonia previous to December 1905. The following are the figures for the months from and including December 1905 up to the end of February last:—

1905.	December	53
1906.	January	73
	February	56
	March	116
	April	223
	May	243
	June	151
	July	170
	August	76
	September	120
	October	99
	November	73
	December	56
1907.	January	54
	February	56

For the causes of these I must refer the hon. Member to my previous Answer to him on the 16th.†

Southampton Trunk Line Telephone Facilities.

Lieutenant-Colonel PHILIPPS (Southampton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the trunk line telephonic facilities at Southampton are in need of improvement; and what steps, if any, are being taken to place the service on a more efficient footing.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Two additional trunk lines between Southampton and London will be brought into use in the next few months. Their completion has been seriously delayed by wayleave difficulties. Additional lines to Portsmouth, Bournemouth, Salisbury, and the Isle of Wight from Southampton are also being provided for the improvement of the trunk service.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 762-3.

Pauper Relief at Leicester, Poplar, West Ham and Woolwich.

MR. C. NICHOLSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number, ratio per thousand, and cost of in-maintenance and out-relief of paupers in the unions of Leicester, Poplar, West Ham, and Woolwich for the last four years.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The particulars desired, so far as they can be given at the present time, are shown in the following table. The figures as to the expenditure in the half-year ended at Lady Day last are not yet available.

Poor Law Union.	Year ended Lady Day.	Total number of paupers (except lunatics in county and borough asylums, &c., but including persons in receipt of medical relief only) on the 1st January in the year.	Rate per 1,000 of paupers on estimated population.	Expenditure on maintenance of indoor paupers (year ended Lady Day).	Expenditure on outdoor relief (year ended Lady Day).
				£	£
Leicester -	1904	5,546	25·2	17,927	24,088
	1905	7,431	33·1	19,599	30,039
	1906	7,948	34·8	24,327	35,666
	1907	7,326 6,244‡	31·6 26·9	10,400†	16,207†
Poplar -	1904	7,760	45·8	60,142	24,399
	1905	11,738	69·1	68,279	34,456
	1906	11,332	66·5	71,513	45,667
	1907	8,512 8,352‡	49·9 48·9	29,234†	17,469†
West Ham -	1904	14,532	23·1	65,681	63,796
	1905	25,931	39·8	68,213	77,335
	1906	20,726	30·7	71,540	82,702
	1907	17,437 16,854‡	25·0 24·2	31,302†	39,422†
Woolwich -	1904	2,241	16·4	21,550	4,922
	1905	2,132	15·3	21,303	4,627
	1906	2,445	17·3	22,698	4,832
	1907	2,563 2,348‡	17·8 16·3	10,347†	2,252†

† For the half-year ended Michaelmas, 1906.
‡ Number of paupers relieved on 13th April, 1907.

Agricultural Labourers on the Continent.

Mr. PARTINGTON: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of agricultural labourers and of other people employed in agriculture in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Austria-Hungary for the years 1881, 1891, and 1901.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The information asked for by the hon. Member can only be given for years in which a census of occupations was taken in the countries covered by the Question. The attached statement embodies all the information available for each country since 1880:—

Statement showing the total number of persons engaged in agriculture and of agricultural labourers in the under-mentioned countries and years:—

(*Note.*—The occupations included under the term agriculture vary in the Census reports for the different countries.)

Country.	Occupations included.	Date of Census.	Persons engaged in Agriculture.	Agricultural labourers.
Germany -	Tillage of soil, stock raising, vegetable, fruit, vine, and tobacco cultivation, dairying - - - - -	1895	8,045,441	5,445,924
		1882	8,063,966	5,763,970
France -	Tillage of soil, threshing, market gardening, mushroom growing, dairying -	1901	8,100,000	3,565,600
		1896	8,430,000	4,022,000
Austria -	Tillage of soil, raising of farm stock, gardening -	1900	8,113,758	5,941,275
		1890	8,394,638	6,379,085
Hungary -	Tillage of soil, stock raising, poultry farming, dairying, market gardening, horticulture - - - -	1900	4,916,008	3,368,996
		1890	4,459,712	2,836,743
Italy - -	Tillage of soil, cultivation of fruits, tobacco growing, stock raising, poultry and bee keeping, mushroom growing, forestry and woodcutting* - - -	1901	9,611,003	4,156,753
		1882	8,566,467	Cannot be stated.
Spain - -	No information available.			

* Forestry workers and woodcutters, which are included in the Italian figures, but not in the totals for other countries, numbered 44,663 in 1901; the corresponding figure for 1882 cannot be stated.

Cost of Visit to India of the Amir of Afghanistan.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the total amount of expenses entailed upon the Indian Government by the visit of the Amir of Afghanistan.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley*).—The total expenditure entailed on the Government of India by the Amir's visit was £205,900, made up as follows:—Expenditure directly connected with tour, £124,500; Military concentration at Agra, £36,700; Viceregal visit and Chapter of the Order of the Bath and the Indian Orders at Agra, £44,700.

Condition and Hours of Labour in Bombay Textile Factories.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Secretary of State for India when he expects to receive the Report from the Government of India as to the conditions and hours of labour in the textile factories of Bombay.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I expect to receive the Report of the Committee in the course of next month.

Meetings of the Commissioners for Charitable Donations and Bequests in Ireland.

MR. McKILLOP (Armagh, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how often did the Commissioners for Charitable Donations and Bequests in Ireland meet during the twelve months preceding 23rd November, 1906, to consider applications under Section 2 of 30 and 31 Vic., cap. 54, and business incidental thereto; how many of such meetings were attended by each of the Commissioners; and whether the Commissioners are entitled to decline to state to an applicant any ground for their refusal to give an opinion or advice.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have referred this Question to the Secretaries to the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests, who inform me that they will submit it to the Commissioners at their meeting on 24th instant. If the hon. Member will renew the Question after that date, I will furnish him with the Commissioners' answer.

Assaults on Postal Officials in Ireland.

MR. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has taken steps to protect His Majesty's Post Office employees, in view of the assaults and robberies of mails which have recently taken place at Inchigeela, Ballinaglevagh, Ballinagree, and at other places.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police authorities have issued the necessary instructions to the local police in the matter. Protection will be afforded in all cases in which it may be necessary.

Irish Boys and the Dublin Telegraph Messenger Service.

MR. ABEL SMITH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the incitement to Dublin parents to keep their children out of the Dublin telegraph messenger service on the grounds that it has for some years past worked as a means of forcing boys into the British Army; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police have no information that parents have been interfered with in this matter. The supply of candidates for appointment in the Dublin telegraph messenger service largely exceeds the demand. No action in the matter appears to be called for.

Disturbances at Athenry.

MR. ABEL SMITH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, after a meeting held at Athenry on Sunday, the 7th instant, addressed by several Members of Parliament, a man named Ryan, a bailiff and gamekeeper on the Rooney property, was attacked by a mob returning from the meeting, and stabbed, so that his life has been endangered; whether any arrests have been made by the police; and whether he intends to take any special measures to restore order and protect life and property in this district.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In this case four men have been arrested, and remanded on bail to petty sessions on 26th instant. It would be contrary to practice and undesirable to enter into details while the case is *sub judice*. An extra force is stationed in the district in order to provide for the preservation of the peace.

Irish Education Rates.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what proportion of the 6s. 7¼d. annually expended per head of the Irish population on public education is raised from Irish sources.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The figures quoted in the Question are taken from the Answer which I gave to the Question of the hon. Member for South Down on the 7th instant.† If the noble Lord will refer to that Answer he will find it specifically stated that all the expenditure there indicated is borne on the Votes of Parliament or the Consolidated Fund.

Inspection of Farm of the Ormaithwaite Estate.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the farm on the Ormaithwaite estate, from which Thomas Walsh, Coolaclarig, North Kerry, was evicted, has been inspected; and, if so, with what result; and whether he can state why he has not been reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received an application from Thomas Walsh and have had the case inquired into. They have informed the owner of the amount which they are prepared to advance Walsh for the purchase of his former holding, and their offer is at present under the owner's consideration.

Sittings of the New Grand Committees.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Prime Minister on how many days each week he proposes that the Grand Committees should sit.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman*): No change is proposed in the existing arrangement.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the total number of officers of captain's rank and above who are now serving in sea-going fleets with brevet rank, that is to say, captains serving as commodores, rear-admirals as vice-admirals, and vice-admirals as admirals; and what was the corresponding figure for April, 1902.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The numbers in the sea-going fleets at the present time are as follows: Two captains serving as commodores, one rear-admiral as vice-admiral, one vice-admiral as admiral. On the 1st November, 1902, two captains were serving as commodores.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in 1902 the Mediterranean Squadron consisted of fourteen battleships with a vice-admiral in command, where now it consists of six battleships with a vice-admiral given admiral's rank with admiral's pay, and a rear-admiral with vice-admiral's rank and pay?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I believe that is so.

Coastguard and Life Saving.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the further reduction or abolition of the coastguard stations is in contemplation; if so, will he say what steps will be taken to secure that the work of life-saving from wrecks will not be seriously hampered, in view of the fact that the coastguard stations afford a means of rapidly communicating tidings of a wreck to the lifeboat stations, one-third of the number of launches made by the Royal National Lifeboat Institution's boats being made in response to communications from coastguard stations, and also in view of the fact that the coastguard rocket apparatus affords in many cases, as in that of the steamship "Jebba," the only means of saving life from wrecks where deep water comes close up to cliffs.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No further reduction of coastguard stations is contemplated pending the consideration of the Report of the Interdepartmental Committee which has just been received.

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many men have been discharged from Woolwich Arsenal since the 1st January, 1907.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxii., 939–40.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): Since the 1st January, 1907, the number of 382 men have been discharged from the Ordnance Factories, thirty-nine from the Inspection Department, Woolwich, and one from the Army Ordnance Department, Woolwich.

Territorial Forces Bill.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to allow the Territorial Forces Bill to be considered by one of the new Standing Committees.

MR. HALDANE: An intimation will be made on this subject in due course.

British Workmen's Report on German Labour Conditions.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether in view of the fact that the six workmen lately returned from studying the conditions of the working classes in Germany have all reported that employers of labour in Germany are clamouring on all sides for skilled labour, he could see his way to applying to the German Government for a list of German employers willing to engage the workmen discharged or about to be discharged from Woolwich and other places.

MR. HALDANE: I fully appreciate the profound impression made on the mind of the hon. Member by the conclusion arrived at by six British workmen after a few weeks study of the economic and social conditions of the working classes of the entire German Empire. The Question is, however, one not of the depth of the hon. Member's impression, but of the reliability of the Report on which it rests. I, too, like the six British workmen have interested myself in the condition of the working classes in Germany. But my impressions are not identical with those of the deputation. I am, unfortunately, not in a state of mind to join in the enthusiasm of the hon. Member or in his joy over his discovery of his remedy for social difficulties.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the Report is inaccurate or untrue?

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir. I never employ such abusive epithets. What I do say is that six British workmen going for a few weeks to survey the whole conditions of the German Empire are not possibly able to give information on which a reliable opinion could be based.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the six workmen went to Germany for the purpose of surveying the social and industrial conditions there?

MR. HALDANE: I have no doubt it was a very pious intention, but you could hardly expect them to arrive at a reliable conclusion in six weeks, any more than you could expect them in the same period to arrive at a conclusive verdict on the subject of preference.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: But did they go to Germany to take a survey of the industrial and labour conditions of the Empire?

MR. HALDANE: I do not know whether they did or not. I presume they did. I am quite sure my hon. friend has gone to other countries, as I have done, in order to obtain as much information as possible, but I doubt if he would claim to be able to present a Report on which a reliable opinion could be based as a result of such a visit.

MR. HUNT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that five of the six who went out were known believers in free trade?

MR. HALDANE: I was not aware of that.

War Office Pensions.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, by the terms of his engagement, the ex-officer employed as a clerk in the War Office is eligible for a pension after ten years service, whereas the ex-soldier in similar employment can only obtain a gratuity after fifteen years service; what is the reason for this differential treatment; and whether he will consider the propriety of placing the latter on the same footing as the former with regard to pensions, Mr. HALDANE: When the employment of retired officers and ex-soldier clerks in the War Office was approved, the pay of the latter was deliberately fixed on a scale sufficiently liberal to exclude all claims to pension, while the pay of the former was based on the admission of a grant of pension. Under the conditions of the Superannuation Act the ex-soldier may be granted a gratuity on cessation of employment. The whole question was thoroughly reconsidered by a Committee two years ago, and it was decided that civil pensions should not be granted to ex-soldier clerks.

Mr. LEA asked if it were not the fact that an officer employed on clerical duties got forty-eight days leave while a warrant officer similarly employed was only allowed fourteen or fifteen days?

Mr. HALDANE replied that he could not go into details, but he believed that the facts referred to in the Question were all taken into consideration in fixing the pension.

Volunteer Corps Liabilities.

Sir J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what would be the position of the officer commanding a Volunteer corps on the disbandment of the unit as regards current liabilities, if, as is laid down in Army Order 76 of 1896, the capitation grants are paid in advance; and what will be his position as regards current liabilities if the corps is transferred to the Territorial Forces.

Mr. HALDANE: As regards the first part of the Question, provision is made in Paragraph 602, Volunteer Regulations, for the issue of a grant on the disbandment of a unit should the Army Council think fit. As regards the second part of the Question, it is the intention that a Volunteer unit shall be transferred to the Territorial Forces as a going concern, and consequently all reasonable liabilities will be recognised.

Officers' Commissions.

Mr. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many officers were given commissions in the cavalry and infantry of the Regular Army during the years ending 31st December, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906, respectively.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War how many officers were given combatant commissions as lieutenants or second lieutenants in the cavalry and infantry of the Regular Army who had previously served in the ranks (exclusive of riding-masters, quartermasters, band-masters, or other positions carrying honorary rank with them) during the years ending 31st December, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906, respectively.

Mr. HALDANE: In reply to these Questions, if my hon. friend will kindly refer to the Return of Army Commissions granted during the years 1885 to 1906, which was recently presented to Parliament, he will find all the information he requires.

Mr. LEA: Is it not the fact that in that Return there is no differentiation made between the commissions given to officers of the Coast Brigade Royal Artillery and to quarter-masters, band-masters, and riding-masters, and therefore, so far as showing the number given for the ranks, the Return is practically useless?

Mr. HALDANE: I do not think that is so, but if my hon. friend will put down another Question I will inquire.

Cost of the Army.

Mr. GUY BARING (Winchester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the cost of the men on the Regular peace establishment of the Army, exclusive of India, serving with the colours or in Section A and B of the Army Reserve, has been or will be reduced under the new scheme; and, if so, by what amounts in each arm, and how is the reduction accounted for.

Mr. HALDANE: Eliminating the Special Contingent, the cost of Regular soldiers serving with the colours and in the Reserve is unaffected by the new scheme. If it should be ultimately decided to obtain a larger Reserve by a shorter colour service of a portion of the Horse and Field Artillery, this will reduce the cost of the Regulars of that arm on mobilisation from £74 17s. 4d. to £63 17s. 6d.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Am I right in understanding that the Return recently issued does not include any reduction whatever on the cost of the men now serving?

MR. HALDANE: No, it does not include any reduction on the cost of the men now serving, but the Special Contingent are taken into account in estimating the cost.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Then the Special Contingent has not been included as a separate item?

MR. HALDANE: No, it is taken into account.

Army Financial Administration.

*MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state to the House the grounds upon which, in the Army Order of 1st February last, the chief accountant of a military command in the United Kingdom has been placed upon the staff of the general in charge of administration; whether, in compliance with the terms of that Order, the general in charge of administration now deals directly with the chief accountant in matters of proposed military expenditure within his command; whether that Order in effect places the chief accountant under the control and orders of the general; and, if so, whether the personal liability of the chief accountant to make good every unauthorised expenditure in the command still subsists.

MR. HALDANE: The Army Order (No. 28 of February, 1907) alluded to by the hon. Member was, on the point referred to, altered in the text by a mere slip, and has been since corrected by the errata at the end of the Army Orders for March which remove the chief accountant from the staff of the general in charge of administration.

*MR. BOWLES: May I ask whether the making of this tremendous change in February last and its withdrawal before the end of March is part of the policy which the right hon. Gentleman has described as that of "clear thinking"?

MR. HALDANE: The MSS. is somewhat ambiguous and might have been interpreted in the sense suggested, but there was no intention of making any change without full consideration.

Reserve of Officers.

LORD J. JOICEY-CECIL (Lincolnshire, Stamford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the training of officers of the Reserve of Officers is suspended for the current year; and, if so, is any economy involved.

MR. HALDANE: The training of officers of the Reserve which for some years past has been non-existent will be formally suspended for the current year. As officers of the Reserve pay their own expenses when called out for training there is no question of economy involved.

Army Financiers in the Field.

SIR ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in connection with the new Territorial and Reserve Forces scheme, full provision was made on the war establishment for a financial adviser and his staff to accompany at once an expeditionary force on taking the field; and, if so, will he issue a Return to Parliament giving all necessary details.

MR. HALDANE: Provision has been made in the war establishments, recently promulgated, for a financial adviser and his staff to accompany an expeditionary force.

Nairobi Prison.

MR. GUY BARING: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what sum is provided in the current Estimates for the new prison at Nairobi; and if the building will be completed during 1907–8.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): £5,000 is provided in the Estimates of the current year for the construction of a new prison at Nairobi. It will not be completed during the year.

Native Police in East Africa.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what complaints have been received from residents in the East African Protectorate with reference to the Native police force; and have such complaints been the subject of specific inquiry by the Colonial Office.

MR. CHURCHILL: As I informed the noble Lord in reply to his Question of Tuesday last, no specific complaints of misconduct by the police have reached the Secretary of State and accordingly no inquiry has been made. The Secretary of State has not, however, lost sight of the possibility of improving the force, and an Ordinance has recently been passed making better provision for its organisation and discipline.

Woolwich Artisans and Emigration.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if a subordinate Department of the Colonial Office has been distributing leaflets about emigration amongst artisans recently dismissed from Government Departments at Woolwich.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir; but the Emigrants Information Office which is under the supervision of the Colonial Office distributes information to inquirers and its circulars have been supplied to the Woolwich Distress Committee and public libraries; from these sources they have probably passed into the hands of artisans.

In reply to a further Question by Captain CRAIG,

MR. CHURCHILL said that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman could place at his disposal any information tending to lead him to believe the Answer was not in substance correct he would be glad to inquire into it.

West Indian Postal Arrangements.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the total sum paid by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom for the conveyance of local correspondence between the various West Indian islands amounts to £22,250 a year; to what Vote is that sum charged; and whether the taxpayers of the West Indian islands make any contribution towards the cost of conveying local correspondence between different parts of the United Kingdom.

MR. CHURCHILL: The amount mentioned by the hon. Member, which is made up as stated in the Answer I gave him to his Question of the 17th instant,† and which is charged to the Colonial Office Vote, is paid for the conveyance within the West Indies, not of local correspondence only, but also of correspondence sent between the Colonies served and the United Kingdom, Canada, and other places. The subsidy to the Canadian contract is not for postal purposes only or mainly.

New Hebrides.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): On behalf of the junior Member for the City of London, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies who will represent the interests of Australia and New Zealand at the Joint Commission with France which will consider the details arising out of the New Hebrides Convention.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is hoped that Australia and New Zealand will be represented by a gentleman nominated by the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth and of New Zealand, with whom I have been in communication on the subject.

Europeans in the Chinese Customs Service.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether four European members of the Chinese Customs service have recently been replaced by Chinese; and, if so, whether these appointments were made with the concurrence of Sir Robert Hart, and fall within the purview of the arrangement to which it is understood the British Government last year consented.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): The hon. Member is probably referring to the recent appointment of four Chinese clerks to the rank of assistant in the Customs service. Three of these are in the Shui-wu Chu, or Revenue Council, at Peking, and the fourth remains at Tsingtan in the German leased territory, where he has been for some time. None of these officials have replaced Europeans, and in any case there is no reason to suppose that the position of Sir Robert Hart with regard to appointments in the Customs is altered.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 955-6.

Assault on British Subjects in China.

Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information regarding the assault committed at Wuchan upon the representative of Messrs. Jardine and Matheson; and whether he can give the House any information as to the conduct of the Chinese officials on the occasion.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: No information on the subject has reached my right hon. friend, but inquiry will be made of His Majesty's Minister in China.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will inquiry be made by cable as this is not the first assault on British subjects in China?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I will convey the hon. Member's wish to my right hon. friend.

New Hebrides Convention.

Mr. BARRIE: On behalf of the junior Member for the City of London, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when it is probable that the Anglo-French Commission, to consider the New Hebrides Convention, will meet.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: As my right hon. friend has already stated, the date has not yet been fixed, but the meeting of the Committee will not be long delayed. This Committee, however, is one for the purpose of settling the points described in Subsection 4 of Article 10 of the Convention.

The Carnegie Celebrations at Pittsburg.

Captain CRAIG: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is able to explain why the British Empire was not officially represented at the celebrations connected with the opening of the Carnegie Institute, at Pittsburg, whereas other Powers, notably Germany, sent influential delegations and high Government officials to attend the ceremony.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Invitations were issued to the heads of foreign missions only, but had no official character. His Majesty's Ambassador had only just returned from an official visit to Canada, and had important business to transact in Washington, which made it impossible for him to absent himself again so soon, especially as during the following week he was due to attend the National Arbitration and Peace Congress Conference at New York, and a Conference at Philadelphia. Neither the German, Austro-Hungarian, French, nor Russian Embassies were represented at Pittsburg. It is understood that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were represented at the celebrations at Pittsburg, and on such an occasion the presence of members of the greatest educational institutions of the country would appear to be the form of representation most suitable and convenient.

Mr. LEA asked if any communication or protest had been received by the British Ambassador on the subject.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I am not aware of any.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Was there any Ambassador present from East Down?

British Representatives at the Hague Conference.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs can he now inform the House who will be the delegates representing Great Britain at the Hague Conference.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The British Plenipotentiaries to the Conference will be:—The right hon. Sir Edward Fry; the right hon. Sir Ernest Satow; the right hon. Lord Reay, late President of the Institute of International Law; Sir Henry Howard, His Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Hague. In addition naval and military expert delegates will be appointed, whose names will be announced in due course.

Teddington Rate Collector.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, although the general district rate and poor rate for the parish of Teddington, Middlesex, are claimed in the same demand note and by the same collector, it is the practice when such rates are not paid to issue two separate summonses, with 3s. costs on each summons; and will he state why in such cases the entire amount due is not claimed under one summons.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): On making inquiry in the matter I am informed that the Teddington justices now include both rates in one summons and have done so for some weeks past.

Taximeter Cab Fares.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the minimum fare for the hiring of hackney carriages in London is fixed by law; whether, having regard to the provisions of 30 and 31 Vic., c. 134, s. 26, and 32 and 33 Vic., c. 115, s. 9 (3), the recent order issued by the Home Office fixing fares for the hiring of hackney carriages furnished with taximeters at a sum less than the statutory minimum is within such provisions; and, if not, will the regulation to these fares be withdrawn.

MR. GLADSTONE: The only fares fixed by my recent Order for taximeter cabs are the fares set out in Schedule K for motor-cabs fitted with taximeters, to which—so I am advised by the Attorney-General—the provisions as to fares in Hackney Carriage Acts before 1869 do not apply. Horsed taximeter cabs are dealt with by Regulation 32, which merely lays down that the fares shall not exceed the fares payable by hirers of ordinary cabs. Any lower scale indicated by the taximeter as payable by the hirer would be a contract scale as recognised by Section 45 of the London Hackney Carriage Act, 1831.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR asked whether the minimum fare fixed by law was one shilling; whether motor-cabs, whether with or without taximeters, were hackney carriages; and how could the right hon. Gentleman within the provisions of the law fix a less fare than one shilling?

MR. GLADSTONE was understood to say that the Attorney-General had advised that this could be done, there being a distinction between a carriage driven by power and a carriage drawn by horses.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR asked whether he was to understand that a motor-car, with or without taximeter, was not a hackney carriage, although it plied for hire.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I am advised as I have stated.

Alexandra Park Races.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the public nuisance caused to the neighbourhood by the races which take place from time to time at Alexandra Park; whether he is aware that the residents of Wood Green, Hornsey, and Harringay are continually protesting against it, on account of the number of scoundrels who attend these races from all parts of London; whether he is aware that, on the days that these races take place, police protection is totally inadequate in the neighbourhoods above mentioned and to the ordinary travelling public on the Great Northern Railway between King's Cross and Wood Green stations; and what steps does he propose taking to cause a cessation of the nuisance, or to provide increased police protection to the general public.

MR. GLADSTONE: No representations have been made to me to the effect of the first part of the Question. This racecourse is licensed annually by the county council, and persons who object to the crowds attending the races have an opportunity every year of opposing the grant of a licence. On the days when races take place special measures are taken by the police for preserving order on the roads and public places in the neighbourhood; but their action does not extend to the premises of the railway company, as these are the property of the company.

MR. LEA asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would cause inquiries to be made as to the facts dealt with in the Question.

MR. GLADSTONE assumed that, if a nuisance was created, representations would be made to him by those concerned, such as they were entitled to make if there was any deficiency of police protection. The main question was primarily one for the Middlesex County Council.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether any case has been brought to his notice of any outrage against either person or property on the part of any person attending Alexandra Park races for many years past?

MR. GLADSTONE: As far as I am aware no representations of the kind have been made to my Department.

Cost of Scottish Post Office Services.

MR. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what was the cost of the Post Office services in Scotland for the Exchequer years 1894–5, 1899–1900, and 1904–5; and what was the revenue from these services during the same years.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The figures desired are as follows:—

Year.	Expenditure. £.	Revenue. £.
1894–5	1,020,000	1,314,000
1899–1900	1,345,000	1,622,000
1904–5	1,479,000	1,912,000

Telegraphists' Duties.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that in certain districts the duties of the telegraph staff are very irregular and consequently arduous; and if he will cause inquiry to be made with the view of ameliorating the conditions of service.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: As my hon. friend is aware, the conditions of service of the telegraph staff and other postal servants are under the consideration of a Select Committee of the House. The Committee has not yet reported, but if the hon. Member will furnish me with particulars of any specific cases of which he has knowledge, in which he believes the duties of the telegraphists are unduly severe, I will have inquiry made respecting them.

Free Education.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether large grants of public money are now being made to schools attended almost exclusively by the children of well-to-do parents; and, if so, whether it is the policy of the present Government to relieve well-to-do persons of their parental duties at the expense of the taxpayer.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The principle to which, if I understand aright, the hon. Member's Question refers in regard to the kind of secondary schools in respect of which Exchequer Grants can properly be paid, is one to which I have been giving special attention during the short time that I have been responsible for the Board of Education, and I am now considering certain changes in the forthcoming regulations for secondary schools which have a bearing upon it. I do not think the matter is one which can be satisfactorily dealt with within the limits proper to an Answer to a Question.

School Age Regulations.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will consider the advisability of drawing the attention of county councils to the fact that they have power to pass a by-law exempting children under seven years of age from being compelled to attend school if the school nearest to their home is more than one mile.

MR. MCKENNA: My experience of county councils is fortunate enough to lead me to suppose that they do not require to be reminded of their powers, and I do not think there is any occasion to issue a circular such as the hon. Member suggests.

Irish Provident Assurance Company.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the President of the

Board of Trade whether he has yet completed his inquiries as to the solvency of the Irish Provident Assurance Company; whether, during the past two years, a number of policy holders ceased paying their premiums owing to fears of the insolvency of the company, and these premiums are now withheld without any compensation whatever being given to the policy holders; and whether he will have this whole matter inquired into, and some reparation made to the people who have been thus defrauded of their money.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by my right hon. friend on the 21st March last year to the hon. Member for Mid Tipperary.† Since then no information has reached the Board of Trade that the Irish Provident Assurance Company are themselves carrying on life assurance business. Consequently the Board of Trade have no special powers with regard to the company. The only power vested in the Board of Trade for companies registered under the Companies Acts is that under Sections 56 and 57 of the Act of 1862 of appointing an inspector upon the application of members holding not less than one-fifth part of the whole of the shares of the company for the time being issued.

Public Companies and Political Funds.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, seeing the difficulty of getting evidence on the subject, if he will issue a circular to all public companies within and contiguous to the area of the administrative county of London carrying on their trade or business in virtue of powers conferred by various Acts of Parliament, public or private, asking them to make a Return showing what sums of money they have given during the last three years to societies, political or otherwise, the names of the recipients in each case, and the dates on which the donations were given.

MR. KEARLEY: I do not think that the Board of Trade could with advantage take the course suggested, but the whole question referred to is receiving very earnest consideration.

Coal Statistics.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what was the total quantity of coal produced in the United Kingdom in the year 1906; and what percentage the amount exported bore to the total produced.

MR. KEARLEY: The quantity of coal produced in the United Kingdom in 1906 was about 251,000,000 tons. The exports, including bunker coal and also the coal equivalent of the exports of coke and patent fuel amounted to 76,750,000 tons or about 30·6 per cent. of the production. If bunker coal be excluded the proportion would be reduced to about 23·2 per cent.

Customs Duties.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what was the approximate amount of Customs duties levied in 1906 (or 1905), and the estimated average rate of duty upon dutiable imports, in respect to goods coming from Natal, Ceylon, British West Indies, and British Guiana.

MR. KEARLEY: I regret that I can only refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by me to the hon. Member for the Govan Division on the 28th February.† No record is kept at the Customs of the country of origin of dutiable goods which are cleared for consumption.

British Museum Reading Room.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the gold-leaf used fifty years ago for the redecoration of the British Museum reading room was guaranteed as British made; and whether he can give an assurance that the firm who have the contract to redecorate the Museum will use only British made gold-leaf for regilding purposes in connection therewith.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): It is believed that the gold-leaf used in 1857 was of British manufacture: there is no record of any guarantee. The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative: it has been specified that British made gold-leaf only is to be used.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 349.

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx, 253.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been directed to the fact that the decoration of the reading room in the British Museum has been placed in the hands of Messrs. Waring and Gillow; if it is proposed that they shall use twenty-five tons of white lead in the process; if he is aware that in France the use of white lead is prohibited in Government contracts; and if he will consider the desirability of taking some steps in the present instance, and of prohibiting the use of white lead in the interior of Government buildings in future contracts.

Mr. HARCOURT: The contract has been placed with the firm named. No white lead will be used, as the paint has been specified to have a zinc oxide base. This specification is adopted in all contracts for Government buildings.

Women Typists.

Mr. THORNTON (Clapham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the petition recently presented to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury by women typists in the Government service asking for an increased maximum salary; and whether, in view of the present low maximum and the entire absence of promotion in this class, he will say if a favourable reply may be expected at an early date.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The memorial has been received and is still under consideration.

Mr. THORNTON: Can the hon. Gentleman say when an answer may be expected?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I cannot at present.

Norwegian Trawlers and Scottish Fishermen.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is aware of the damage done to fishermen's nets off Wick by the Norwegian trawler "Campania," and whether, in view of the fact that the owners of the said vessel have declined to pay any compensation, he will bring the matter before the Norwegian representative in this country.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): The matter referred to by my hon. friend has been brought to my notice. Where damage has been done to fishermen's nets by foreign fishing vessels the form of procedure is for the aggrieved fishermen to submit their statement combined with an undertaking to go, if required, as witnesses to the country to which the accused boat belongs This, I am informed, they are unwilling to do in this case.

Beauly and Ness Fisheries.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can now state the names of the landlords who claim fishery rights to the estuary of the Ness and Beauly rivers; and to what extent those rights extend seawards from the mouth of the Beauly and Ness rivers, respectively.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am making local inquiries into the matter referred to by my hon. friend and regret that they are not yet sufficiently complete to enable me to give an Answer. Perhaps he will kindly repeat the Question.

Paisley Licensing Case.

Mr. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to the remarks made by Sheriff Darling Lyell in regard to the case at Paisley, where two of the local magistrates, one a joiner named M'Naughton and the other a plumber named Kilpatrick, reported on structural alterations necessary at a licensed house, and where the joiner who undertook the reconstruction of the premises was the very Mr. M'Naughton who, in his capacity as magistrate, had ordered the work to be done to his own satisfaction and that of his brother magistrates; and where not only was this so, but the plumber who contracted to do the plumbing work to the orders of Mr. M'Naughton was the brother magistrate who also inspected, reported, and concurred in requiring this work to be done; and, having in view the foregoing facts, will he indicate what action he proposes to take in order to prevent the recurrence of such an incident.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As legal questions are involved I have submitted the Papers in this case to the law officers for their opinion.

Scottish Deer Forests.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the action of Mr. Coates, the proprietor of the Glenbana estate, Aboyne, in turning tenants out of paying farms in order to extend the area of deer forests, and of Mr. Heaven, a neighbouring landlord, who is extending the area of grass on his estate and destroying houses, in order to preserve game and give opportunity for rabbit shooting; and whether the Government propose to take such action as will immediately prevent rural depopulation by such policies as those pursued by Mr. Coates and Mr. Heaven.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have no information as to the statements made by the hon. Gentleman. With regard to the intention of the Government on matters relating to rural depopulation I may refer him to the Small Landholders Bill now before the House.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Is the right hon. Gentleman unable to get any information as to what is going on in this district?

[No Answer was returned.]

Footpath Rights in Aberdeenshire.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the refusal of the parish council of Birss, Aberdeenshire, to vindicate the public right to use a footpath which has been used for over fifty years; and whether, in view of the difficulties experienced in working the existing law and of the rapid disappearance of these public rights, he can see his way to introduce remedial legislation.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have no information on the subject referred to by the hon. Gentleman, and I can only repeat that the desire to preserve to the public all existing rights of way has the hearty sympathy of His Majesty's Government. I cannot give any undertaking now as to future legislation.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that litigation has arisen, and that the failure of the parish councils to put the law into operation is causing a great deal of scandal?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will give close attention to the matter.

Grassmarket, Edinburgh.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that the Edinburgh Town Council has resolved to hold the market for sheep, and possibly also for cattle, in the street of the Grassmarket; and if he will consult the Local Government Board for Scotland as to whether this use of a public thoroughfare lined by dwelling houses and shops is in accordance with the sanitary regulations of the Board.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have consulted the Local Government Board for Scotland who have no information on the point referred to by my hon. friend. It is not in the power of the Board to interfere unless a nuisance within the meaning of the Public Health Act should arise hereafter in consequence of the action of the Town Council.

Scottish Education Acts.

Mr. GULLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in connection with the Education (Scotland) Bill, he will introduce a Bill consolidating all the statutes with regard to education in Scotland, and so satisfy the demand of those administering these statutes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: While there would be advantages in passing such a consolidating measure, its preparation may more profitably be undertaken when the present legislative proposals of the Government as to education in Scotland have been given effect to. In any case it is quite impossible for the Government to undertake further legislation on the subject this session.

Port William Church Dispute.

MR. GULLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland why the Churches (Scotland) Act Commission, notwithstanding the terms of their memorandum of 19th October, 1906, that it is only in very extraordinary circumstances that the Commissioners could hold that the Church which is entitled to the property by statistics should not possess the buildings, has allocated to the Free Church the church at Port William, although the Free Church there has no minister, no office bearers, and no Sunday services; whether there was any local investigation at Port William; and whether he can hold out any hope that the Commission will reconsider this case and allocate the church to the United Free Church, which is entitled to it by statistics.

MR. SINCLAIR: This is a very peculiar case, as those who are acquainted with the circumstances are aware; and after very careful consideration the Commission have come to the decision which has been announced. I have no option but to regard it as final; as this is a matter which the Act leaves entirely to the discretion of the Commission.

MR. GULLAND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in 1906 the Free Church congregation presented a memorial to the Commissioners informing them of their intention of joining the United Free Church, and asking to have the property allocated? Why was not that carried out?

MR. SINCLAIR: I can only say that the whole of the facts were before the Royal Commission when they came to their decision.

Dangerous Lunatics.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether a dangerous patient in a district lunatic asylum may be discharged and handed over to relatives relieved, but not cured; and, in that case, whether the lunacy authorities have no further charge or responsibility.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): A patient who, when admitted, was dangerous, may on the sheriff being satisfied and on medical certificates, be discharged when this can be done without risk of injury to the public or the patient. As to the latter part of the Question, it does not appear to me that there is any such charge or responsibility if the procedure is correctly followed.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he will consider the advisability of taking the necessary steps to ensure that all cases of dangerous lunatics who have committed assault resulting in loss of life should be dealt with in a criminal lunatic asylum, instead of relegating them to a district asylum.

I beg also to ask the Lord Advocate, whether, seeing that the presence of criminal lunatics who have committed murder is detrimental to the general freedom from severe discipline in district asylums, the beneficial effect of what is termed the open-door system being acknowledged, he will take the necessary steps to keep the district asylums as far as possible free from criminal lunatics who have committed murder or attempted murder.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: I may be allowed to answer these two Questions together. The sending of these cases to a district asylum is no doubt warranted if the procedure under the 15th Section of the Lunacy Act of 1862 is adopted. I may say, however, that the other course, which is also correct in law, appears to me to be more advisable in practice, viz., that when crime has been committed by a lunatic the criminal authorities should deal with it in accordance with their regular powers under Sections 87 and 88 of the Lunacy (Scotland) Act, 1857. There may no doubt be exceptional cases, but my desire is that the practice which I think to be preferable should be adopted.

Irish Board of Works—Promotion of Clerks.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if seniority in the service and not in the department was held by the Board of Works to justify recent promotion, especially that of Mr. Sidwell in the Accountant's Branch of their office; if so, can he say why this principle was not applied by them in the case of a promotion in the Buildings Division of the Secretary's Branch made in the beginning of 1905, when a Second Division clerk of six years' service was promoted to a staff post, passing over a Second Division clerk in the same division of over twelve years' service; and whether the Board were aware when making this promotion that the promoted clerk was a Scottish Presbyterian while the clerk who was passed over was an Irish Catholic.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The promotions in both cases were made on grounds of merit and not of seniority as, in the case of Mr. Sidwell, I have already stated. I regret that the hon. Member should have thought fit, in view of my previous Answers, to put the last part of the Question.

Irish Land Act Finance.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been called to the stoppages which have been made out of certain grants payable to county councils in Ireland to meet alleged financial deficiencies in the working of the Irish Land Act of 1903; can he state how these deficiencies have arisen; if he is aware that, if the Treasury persist in their present action, it will have the effect of dislocating local government all over Ireland, and also have a most injurious effect on the progress of land purchase in Ireland; and will he publish the rules under which the Treasury have acted in this matter.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Under Section 29 (2) of the Irish Land Act, 1903, the Guarantee Fund is liable to make good any deficiency on the Income Account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund. So far as these deficiencies are caused by the issue of Guaranteed Stock at a discount, the Ireland Development Grant, as one of the constituent parts of the Guarantee Fund, is the first to be charged under Section 38; so that no charge for deficiencies arising from that cause can fall on the Local Taxation Grants so long as the Ireland Development Grant is able to meet them But there are other deficiencies on the income account with which the Local Taxation Grants, as constituents of the Guarantee Fund, are directly chargeable, and I fear there is no possibility of avoiding the occurrence of such deficiencies when advances at 2¾ per cent. interest are provided for by the public issue of stock bearing the same rate of interest, and no margin is allowed between the rate of interest payable and the rate of interest receivable to cover incidental losses. These losses arise from the following causes:—(1) Arrears of payment of the purchase annuities. (2) The system of issuing stock entitled to a half year's dividend on the first following dividend day, although the subscribers to the stock are allowed to pay up their subscription by instalments which may extend up to, or even beyond, that dividend day. It is clear that, when the National Debt Commissioners have to pay a half-year's dividend on a certain day, and have not had the use of the money for a full six months before that day, a deficiency must result. (3) The gale day on which the purchase annuities are payable is in each case one month earlier than the dividend day. This interval is necessary to enable the annuities to be collected and paid over to the National Debt Commissioners before the dividend day. But the result is that the payment received from a tenant on his first gale day includes interest for one month less than the period in respect of which dividend is payable on the stock. (4) The capital of the Land Purchase Fund, so far as not required for advances, is temporarily invested by the National Debt Commissioners in securities. The interest on these securities is received on varying dates, and at the date when the balance of the income account must be struck there is always a temporary deficiency, due to the fact that a certain amount of interest which has accrued has not yet been received into the account. (5) On large transactions such as those of the Land Purchase Fund it is impossible to have the whole of the capital moneys invested and earning interest on every day of the year. There must always, therefore, be a loss of income from unproductive balances. A careful analysis of the charge of £70,996 which has been made upon the Local Taxation Grants shows it to be attributable to these five causes in the following proportions:—(1) Arrears of annuities, £9,119; (2) Unearned dividend on issues of stock, £23,750; (3) Advance dividend, £13,650; (4) Interest due but not received, £15,500; (5) Unproductive balances, £8,977; total, £70,996. The arrears of purchase annuities are for the most part temporary. I understand that, since the account was made up on 31st January last, a sum of £4,046 has been recovered on account of the £9,119 then in arrear. The chief item of charge is the unearned dividend of £23,750 arising out of the mode of issue of the stock which is required by custom and the convenience of the City. It is open to question whether this charge could not properly be treated as a capital charge to be paid for by annuity out of the Development Grant. But an amendment of the Act would be necessary to enable this to be done, as the Act at present requires (Section 29 (1)) that the dividends on the stock shall be paid out of the income of the fund. The advance dividend charge will not be made good until the purchase annuities are completed, many years hence. A further charge of the same kind must arise on every issue of the stock. The deficiency of income which arises from unproductive balances is an inevitable and a permanent loss. The only charges which are of a temporary nature are those relating to arrears and to interest accrued but not received. After analysing and reviewing all the charges, I have come to the conclusion that it should be possible to avoid charging the Local Taxation Grants in full for those items by making use of the working balance which was rendered available by the Labourers Act of last Session, and I propose to have the Treasury Rules amended to enable this to be done. I may add that the Treasury Rules were published in House of Commons Paper No. 151 of 1905.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: The Answer which the hon. Gentleman has given is of so long and complicated a character that it will be necessary for us to see it in print before we can thoroughly grasp its significance. But may I ask him if I am right in what I gather as to the meaning, so far as I have been able to gather it, that the charge put down against these counties is not a genuine charge; that is to say, nothing of the nature of a real or permanent charge, but more or less in the nature of a book-keeping charge, and will be wiped out in the ordinary course? Then I gather further that—the hon. Gentleman will tell me if I am right—the real permanent charge is this charge in connection with the unearned dividend of £23,000. If I am right in that, I wish to ask him this Question—Is it a fact that the Treasury have issued regulations to the effect that when land stock is issued to any person in, say, March or April, on the 21st June six months interest is to be paid to the owner of that stock, although not earned; and if so, whether that is not in violation of the 28th section of the Land Act, which specifically provides that interest on land stock is only to be paid at the rate of 2¾ per cent., and if that is so, are not the owners of this stock receiving for these two or three months more than interest at the rate of 2¾ per cent.? A further question—Out of the Development Grant £50,000 for four years was to be set aside to meet the charges on the working of the Land Act. What has become of the £200,000? Is it earning interest, and if so, why is not the interest devoted to meeting these charges? I will put further questions when I have opportunity.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: With regard to the last supplementary Question, I should like the hon. Gentleman to defer it. With regard to the first, as to the arrears of annuities, I cannot say how far they will be temporary or permanent. I have already said that about half of the arrears outstanding when the accounts were made out have since been paid. With regard to the second Question, as to the dividends paid for the short period, I quite admit that on the face of it the view which has been put forward by the hon. Member appears to have a good deal of reason behind it. He will be aware that we cannot always arrange for the issue of stock on the 31st December or 30th June. That is obvious, and in the flotation of a large loan like the last—£7,000,000—it is impossible to have the whole sum paid up upon one fixed date; so we are advised by those who want to place the stock to the best advantage. The third point has been already considered by the legal advisers of the Government, and I am afraid that they have decided against him.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: May I ask, does the new rule, to which the hon. Gentleman refers, have a retrospective effect, so as to apply to the sums now charged to the various counties in Ireland?

MR. RUNCIMAN: So far as the amount of interest is concerned, I am afraid that the new rule will not apply. The rules referred to by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford, were rules drawn by the Treasury.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the sum of £50,000 per annum out of the Irish Development Grant has been duly carried to the income account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund for the last four years, in accordance with Section 38 of the Irish Land Act of 1903; if so, is the sum of £200,000 still available for the payment of dividends on Irish land stock in accordance with Section 29 of the said Act; is the whole or any part of the said sum of £200,000 still unexpended; if so, is interest accruing thereupon, and what is the amount of such interest, if any; is there from time to time a balance of funds arising from the sale of land stock on hand awaiting distribution amongst vendors of Irish lands; if so, is the same lying at interest at any bank or elsewhere, and what is the amount of such interest, if any; and is such interest as the above available for payment of the aforesaid dividends.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The sum of £200,000 has been paid from the Ireland Development Grant to the Income Account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund, and has to the extent of £102,000 been used in meeting deficiencies of income, there being originally no power to use it otherwise. Section 15 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906, however, directs that as from the 31st March, 1906, the unexpended portion of the £200,000 shall be used as a working balance, and shall not be reckoned as part of the Income Account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund in determining whether that income is insufficient under Section 29 (2) of the Irish Land Act, 1903. The working balance so obtained amounts to £98,000, and forms part of the general fund which is invested as closely as possible. All funds arising from issues of guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. stock, so far as they are not required for the purpose of immediate advances, are invested in securities of a temporary nature. The income derived from such investments is applied towards payment of the dividends on the stock.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what is done with the money raised for the purposes of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1903, during the interval between the issue of the stock and the payment of the money over to the landlords; whether the money is invested in any way; if so, what amount of interest is paid upon it; is it lodged in bank; if so, in what banks in England or Ireland, and do these banks pay any interest on the amount in hand; what is the amount already received under the various issues; how much of it is unallotted; how is it invested; and what interest is received upon it.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The money raised for the purposes of the Irish Land Act, 1903, is carried to the credit of the Irish Land Purchase Fund under Section 28 (4). This fund is under the control of the National Debt Commissioners, who invest the cash placed to its credit, so far as not required for immediate advances, in securities of a temporary nature. The uninvested portion of the fund is lodged at the Bank of England, but no interest is allowed. The total amount of cash received in respect of issues of stock is £18,823,839, of which £18,371,826 has been advanced under the Act, and the balance of £452,013 is invested in £160,000 Treasury bills at an average rate of interest of $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., and £290,000 Exchequer Bonds at 3 per cent.

MR. HAYDEN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what amount of this money at one period was lying in the bank bearing no interest, and whether during any portion of that time any of the money was lying at the Bank of Ireland bearing no interest?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman able to say, in view of the serious state of affairs which has arisen in connection with the finance of the Land Act, which seems to be completely broken down, that he can hold out any hope of the revision of the whole matter?

MR. RUNCIMAN: It is not for me to make any announcement on the subject. With regard to the balances lying at the Bank of England, I cannot give the figures without notice.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that from time to time enormous sums have been lying in these banks without bearing interest?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Bank of England is the only bank used, and it is not usual for them to pay interest on balances lying there.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: This subject is of enormous importance, and I must put a Question to the Prime Minister. Apparently the whole finance of the Act of 1903 has broken down. Will he take this Minute into consideration, and see whether it is possible to have an early opportunity for discussing it, as both he and the House will see how impossible and inconvenient it is for us to attempt to discuss it by Question and Answer?

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Arising out of the first part of the Answer referring to the £450,000, may I ask whether it is not a fact that several millions of land is so far forward in the matter of sale that there is no necessity for a balance of this kind?

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): May I ask when it is proposed to make a further issue of land stock, and what will be the amount?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): We entirely recognise the great importance of this Minute, and if any special negotiation is required to secure a special opportunity of discussing it, we will be ready to enter into that negotiation, but I should think one of the Votes of the Estimates would afford an opportunity.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will try and arrange that one of the first days possible should be allotted to Irish Estimates, so that we may raise the question soon.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): Is it not a fact that interest can be got from the Bank of England on balances?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Post Office and Guaranteed Land Stock Transactions.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Fermanagh, I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any regulations have been made to enable persons desirous of taking advantage of Section 2 of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1891, to do so by purchase and transfer of Guaranteed Land Stock through the Post Office; if not, will he give the matter his early attention, and will he see that the regulations are duly published at post offices, such as Boyle and Castlerea, county Roscommon, and others, where there are many persons who could usefully avail themselves of the advantages of Section 2.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: No regulations have been made by the Treasury under the Section mentioned by the hon. Member, but I understand that they are communicating with the various Departments concerned in order to ascertain whether, having regard to the manner in which the stock is held and to the fact that it is not freely purchasable any regulations for transfer could be usefully made.

The Committee of Defence.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what was the actual expenditure incurred in connection with the visit to the Mediterranean stations by the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for War, in conjunction with the Admiralty, for that purpose; and upon what Estimates presented to Parliament has such expenditure been charged.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As the journey of this Committee was not confined to the Mediterranean it would be difficult to ascertain the exact proportion of the cost incurred in connection with their visit to the Mediterranean. The expenditure for the whole inquiry amounted to £907 9s. 11d. Of this sum the payments for services of members of the Committee were charged to Army Vote 12, Item H; the Admiralty's messing bill to Vote 6 F.3, and the travelling expenses to Vote 6 E.2. No additional expenditure for coal or stores was involved.

Scottish Supply.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange to allow at least two full sittings for the discussion of the Scottish Estimates.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Owing to the time which will have to be given to the Scottish Land Bill, I doubt if it will be possible to give two days to the Estimates.

Trawling in the Moray Firth.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been drawn to the illegal trawling going on in the Moray Firth which has led to the prosecution and punishment of British fishermen; whether the boats thus engaged are British-owned boats that have been placed under a foreign flag solely for the purpose of being better able to prosecute trawling that has been held in the British courts to be illegal, and that the owners of these trawlers are engaging crews to break the law by serving on these trawlers, and in the knowledge that these men are liable to fine and imprisonment in consequence of fulfilling their labour contracts; and whether, in view of these things, he proposes to introduce legislation which will enable the courts to punish the Hull and Grimsby capitalists who are the real offenders, and who pocket the profits derived from the illegal employment of these crews, and also to forfeit those British-owned trawlers which have been placed under a foreign flag in order that they may be protected whilst breaking the British law.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My attention has been called to the matter referred to by my hon. friend. The facts as stated may be taken as generally correct. I am, however, unable to undertake to introduce legislation on the lines proposed in the Question.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if it is not the fact that the boats mentioned in the Question are properly registered in Norway, and are entirely amenable to the Norwegian law?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware, but my impression is that the facts are as stated in the Question.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman have full inquiry made as to whether there is any truth at all in the suggestions contained in this Question?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know that any inquiry is necessary. I imagine that the facts are not disputed.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman in favour of Englishmen being allowed the same privileges as foreigners?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am in favour of all Englishmen who break the laws of their country—which in this case is Scotland (laughter)—or rather a Scottish law being held liable for it, and I should be glad to see those who provoke them to do it also made liable.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to make the law applicable to foreigners as well?

[No Answer was returned.]

Colonial Conference.

Mr. HUNT: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, except in matters of defence, the Press may be furnished every day with a report of the proceedings and debates of the present Conference, in order that the people of the Empire may know what is going on from day to day.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is entirely for the Conference itself to decide how far it will give publicity to its proceedings; and the existing arrangement of issuing on each day of meeting a brief statement of what has passed was settled by it at the outset. The question as to complete publication of proceedings will be considered later.

Mr. HUNT: May I ask if the Colonial Premiers object to the debates on

Preferential Imperial Trade being reported fully, and, if not, what did Lord Elgin mean by saying——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice should be given of that Question.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he understood that the remaining portion of the debate on the Army Bill would finish by Tuesday night, that the Government would proceed with the Budget resolutions on Wednesday, and he supposed they would take Supply on Thursday. He would be glad to know what Supply it was proposed to take.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the Navy Estimates would be taken first; then, if occasion admitted, the Board of Agriculture.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) said that a few days ago he was allowed as a matter of personal explanation to call attention to a speech delivered in his constitutency by the hon. and junior Member for Merthyr Tydvil.† In view of what happened on that occasion and what had since happened it was, he thought, proper that he should read a communication which he received on Saturday from the hon. and junior Member for Merthyr Tydvil. It was as follows:—

"Dear Edwards,

"Now that the Wrexham incident stands out in its true perspective, I feel that I have neither been just to you nor to myself in my handling of it. When your letter came charging me with abusing my position in having gone into your constituency and wilfully lied about you—for that is how I read it—my first impulse was to toss the thing into the fire and take no notice. You see, I was thinking of myself and my innocence of the charge, and did not at the moment realise your point of view. What I had in my mind at Wrexham when your name was mentioned, and what I still continue to believe I said, was that your expenses were paid by your Party. Be this, however, as it may, my object in now writing is to express my regret that any words of mine should have given you offence; and to apologise for any looseness of speech which may have been capable of being interpreted to mean that you in any way accepted money for services rendered to your Party. This is hurriedly written under difficulties, and you are at full liberty to use it in any way you think fit.

"Yours faithfully,

"J. Keir Hardie."

He quite frankly accepted this withdrawal, and so far as he was concerned, the incident was now at an end.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Leave given to the Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 123.]

Minutes of the proceedings of the Committee to be printed. [No. 123.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).

Sir Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping and Manufactures: Mr. Attorney-General, Sir Frederick Cawley, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Sir Francis Channing, Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Alexander Cross, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. David Davies, Mr. Vaughan-Davies, Mr. Timothy Davies, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Akers-Douglas, Mr. Duckworth, Mr. Charles Duncan, Mr. Ferens, Mr. Munro-Ferguson, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Haddock, Mr. Harrison-Broadley, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Idris, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Kettle, Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. Bonar Law, Colonel Long, Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Lupton, Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh, Mr. M'Killop, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Murray, Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Parkes, Mr. Partington, Dr. Pollard, Major Renton, Mr. Thomas Richards, Sir George Robertson, Mr. John Robertson, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Rogers, Sir Robert Ropner, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Herbert Samuel, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Soames, Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Austin Taylor, Mr. Theodore

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 385-390.

Taylor, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Verney, Mr. Walrond, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. George White, Mr. Osmond Williams, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Young.

Report to lie upon the Table.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

INCOME TAX.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Income Tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): It was agreed on Thursday last when we closed the debate that we should have an opportunity to-day on this the first of the Resolutions proposed at this sitting to continue the general examination of the Budget proposals with the advantage of the reflection allowed in the interval. I confess that the results of that reflection are not altogether comforting. I said, as a first impression after the Chancellor of the Exchequer's very interesting speech, that it seemed to me that this Budget was in some respects a disquieting Budget. Further reflection only confirms me in that view; I think it is not merely a disquieting Budget, it is an ominous Budget. What is the position which the Chancellor of the Exchequer's financial statement has disclosed? He congratulates the House and the country upon a year of exceptional trade prosperity, and it follows upon a year of the same character. Yet we find there is not that expansion in the yield of our taxes which everyone would have wished to find, and which, I think, most people would have expected to find, given the premisses described by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman, with a very considerable surplus in his hands this year, and an anticipation—I think a justifiable anticipation—of a considerably larger surplus next year, is unable to give any remission of taxation in the current year. Further, having regard to the state of the finances, the limits he himself has placed on his activity as Finance Minister, and the demands which are made as to social reform, he cannot hold out any hope of a reduction of taxation next year. Am I not right in saying that is an ominous statement? The Chancellor of the Exchequer says he cannot deal with the surplus in such a way as to involve any permanent diminution of revenue on a considerable scale. Accordingly now, for the first time, in piping times of peace, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announces that he looks forward to a permanent income tax of 1s. in the pound.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I never said anything of the kind. I said we must regard the income-tax, in my opinion, as a permanent part of our fiscal machinery.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am referring to one portion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech and he is answering me out of another portion, and I think he may find it hard to reconcile the two. In justifying his income-tax proposals the right hon. Gentleman said we must now regard the income-tax as a permanent part of our taxation. I will comment on that later. But I am now dealing with the statement that, having regard to the demands upon us, he cannot deal with the surplus, large as it appears to be, in such a way as to involve any permanent diminution of revenue. What is that but saying he cannot reduce the taxes from the level at which they stand; that if he has a surplus it is mortgaged, that a larger surplus would still be mortgaged, and that no surplus he can contemplate on the present taxation is sufficient to meet the demands he foresees within the near future? He took credit to himself for not promising old age pensions. I am not aware that anybody ever promised them. Who did? [An HON. MEMBER: "Joe," and cheers.] I suppose hon. Members who cheer mean to say that my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham did. I challenge them to produce the passage containing that promise; they cannot do it. What my right hon. friend did was to expound to the country a scheme elaborated by a non-Party committee, on a more moderate economical, and prudent basis than any which has been put before the country from any other source, and he said that that was a scheme which was simple and which anyone could understand. He for one was prepared to support a scheme on that basis, and I for another am prepared to support a scheme on that basis now. I see no reason for going back from it in any degree. It is more prudent and wiser finance, more calculated to encourage thrift and promote good conduct among the masses of the people than the non-contributory scheme, to which alone the Chancellor of the Exchequer will lend any countenance. The right hon. Gentleman takes credit to himself for not having promised a scheme. He has gone very near to promising a scheme next year, and all his friends so understand it. Perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer will take note of the interpretation placed on his utterance, and if he does not mean to pledge himself to old age pensions next year——

MR. ASQUITH: My words were perfectly free from ambiguity.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the right hon. Gentleman's words amount to as good a Parliamentary pledge as I ever heard. It is patent that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has no money to give away, and we have now to contemplate a permanent income-tax of 1s. in the pound. That is a deplorable thing, and I contrast it with the observations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer twelve months ago. The right hon. Gentleman said he associated himself with the declarations of his predecessors, that an income-tax of a uniform rate of 1s. in the pound——

MR. ASQUITH: A uniform rate.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That such a tax in a time of peace was impossible to justify and difficult to defend. Let me read on. He said—

> "It is a burden on the trade of the country which in the long run affects not only profits, but wages."

A normal 1s. tax even with an abatement to 9d. on incomes of less than £2,000 a year still is a burden on the trade of the country, which in the long run affects not only profits, but wages. And I go on to quote the Chancellor of the Exchequer—

> "And from the point of view of the nation it is open to the same objection as a continuance at an abnormal figure of the floating debt—namely, that it tends to destroy or at any rate to contract a most readily available reserve on which the State can draw in times of unforeseen emergency."

It is true that the Chancellor of the Exchequer put in that carefully chosen qualification about a "uniform" rate of 1s., but these objections are wider and are not affected by the qualification. They apply to any income-tax the normal rate of which is as high as 1s. I venture to express a personal opinion that of all the taxes which affect the wages fund, which affect the amount of capital available for investment, and therefore react directly upon the amount of employment for the people of this country, there are none which bear with such serious weight as the income-tax. By indirect taxation you may raise what a man pays on wine, cigars, or other luxuries, and if he has not a sufficient margin of income he will reduce his expenditure proportionately, and he will continue to lay by as before; but when you come to the income-tax and tax his savings, then I think you directly deter him from increasing those savings, and he is apt to regard that as something beyond his control, and accordingly, instead of spending less, he spends what he did before; he pays the additional income-tax, and the amount he has available for investment, for the extension indirectly of employment, and for the promotion of wage-earning industries is thereby lessened. An even more serious objection is the objection taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer last year that the income-tax is our great reserve for any emergency. Why is that so? It is because as a financial engine it is the one which you can work faster or slower, of which you can alter the speed or intensity with less disturbance to trade than any other tax—not only than any direct tax, but any indirect. The income-tax stands almost alone among our direct taxes as the great engine which the Chancellor of the Exchequer can employ to meet a temporary emergency; and I say the trifling abatement which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has given on incomes of less than £2,000 a year is altogether insufficient to relieve the strain which the income-tax payer suffers under, or to restore to the tax that elasticity for purposes of emergency which every financier desires to see. And that is not the whole matter. It is not only the income-tax payer for whom the Chancellor's statement is full of meaning, and, as our neighbours across the Channel say, gives furiously to think. The working classes as well as the direct taxpayer must be content to pay as before. Is the last general election already so far behind us that Members have forgotten the piteous cry put up on behalf of the consumer from a hundred Liberalplatforms? Here is the Chancellor of the Exchequer of a Radical Government, with a surplus of £3,500,000, and looking forward to a further surplus next year, telling the consumer that he must continue to "pay, pay, pay." Whilst I share to the full the desire expressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and felt in every quarter, to make some provision for the old age of the deserving poor, I think he is placing an unnecessary burden on the taxpayer, and an unnecessary difficulty in his own way, by the determination he has expressed not to look at any form of contributory scheme. For my part, I think he would be wise not to exclude the possibility of contributory schemes, difficult perhaps to start, but becoming, as I think they would, more popular as their provisions become known, and as the benefit earned under them began to be reaped; and I am certain that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would proceed upon those lines, in the first instance at any rate, he would need to make a smaller draft upon the Exchequer, and would find himself less handicapped than he is by his own declaration. I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech shows that we have come very near to the end of our tether on the present basis of taxation. And now comes in the cloven hoof. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says the Party opposite is a free trade Government and a free trade Party. Of course he uses the term free trade in the very restricted and imperfect sense in which we habitually apply it in this country, as meaning a Government which does not hesitate to tax your trade provided it can prove that no British subject derives any benefit from the tax, but which refuses to adopt any fiscal expedient if it could be shown that a British subject might conceivably be benefited thereby. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that that indeed narrows his field, but only in the sense in which a wise builder narrows his field of operations to firm ground and avoids the unfathomable morass. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] I wonder whether the hon. Gentlemen who cheer that statement really believe that the fiscal system of every country except Turkey and Great Britain is based upon an unfathomable morass—whether they really believe that every one of the great self-governing Colonies, the kindred nations across the seas, whose representatives are now present in our capital, have based their whole system of government on an insecure foundation, and that we, and we alone, with the single exception of His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey, have found the true way?

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I heard protection described by a speaker at a mass meeting of electors during the last Presidential campaign in the United States as a "grand larceny upon the American people."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I suppose the hon. Member was one of those who contributed cheers to that statement. I was not referring particularly to the hon. Member, but I am delighted to hear him. That really is characteristic of the sort of stuff that did duty on a hundred Liberal platforms. I am not going to turn aside to argue the question fully at the present moment, but I am going to make two observations which are sufficient for my purpose and will show that I do not fear to meet the hon. Gentleman on the issue he has raised. The hon. Member quotes his opinion as if he would have us believe that the American people are willing to abandon their system. Does he suppose that they are?

MR. LYNCH: They would like to abandon it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If they wished to abandon it they can do so. ["No, no."] But every man who knows anything about America knows two things about it. First, that the tariff there is protectionist in a sense and with an exaggeration that no living man in this country has ever suggested, and which we who call ourselves tariff reformers, and I among them, never suggested. Secondly, while the American people may desire to modify that tariff in some respects, there is not a sane man in the House or out of it who supposes that either he or I will live to see them abandon the system by which their prosperity has been attained and by which it is maintained. It is really absurd of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to suggest that a system which is practically universal outside this country is based on foundations so insecure that no British Minister would be safe in trusting to build upon them. The right hon. Gentleman said that tariff reform was strangled at the last election by the necessity which followed from it of the taxation of raw material, and it was that necessity which had proved fatal to the movement at the last election.

MR. ASQUITH: What I said was, and what I now repeat is, that the movement was entangled with and strangled by its avowed intention to tax the first necessaries of life, such as meat and corn, and what we demonstrated as its necessary consequence was that if justice was to be done to all parts of the Empire in any fair system of preference the taxation of raw material could not be avoided.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I was, it is true, skipping a portion of the right hon. Gentleman's declaration, and on it I must make a few observations. The observation as to taxation of food needs no demonstration, but only a reminder that the Party opposite will have to continue to be food-taxers unless they are false to every promise and pledge of social reform they have given—not only food-taxers on the present basis, but some of them are beginning to ask whether they will not have to increase that basis in order to provide a satisfactory system of old age pensions. Then as to raw material, I am amazed that a man of the general capability, candour, and fairness of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with such a clear perception of the question, should repeat in the House, after plenty of time for reflection, the fable which he industriously circulated on public platforms, that we were, now or at any other time, to place a tax on raw materials.

Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

MR. ASQUITH: The right hon. Gentleman made no such proposal. What he has proposed was not the question we had to consider; the question was what would inevitably follow.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: We deny either that we proposed or that we would be obliged to put a tax on raw material. Has the Chancellor of the Exchequer ever studied any foreign tariff? What is the object of the modern German tariff? The object is, not to exclude all goods from the outside, but to make the imports consist as far as possible of those classes of goods which are of the most benefit to the whole community. Germany wishes to do a big foreign trade as well as ourselves, and they desire, as far as the action of the Government can guide and control it, that they should be protected so as to secure that their imports should consist of raw material or of goods on which very little work has been done, and in order that for the masses of their own people they may secure the maximum of employment and industry in their own country. Not only is it not true to say that we shall be forced to tax raw material by any principles we have enunciated, but it would be the very reverse of the principles by which we are guided to do anything of the kind. Why is it that the right hon. Gentleman thinks we should be driven to it? He says that you cannot give a fair system of preference among the Colonies unless you do. That shows the total and unpardonable ignorance of the right hon. Gentleman, after we have discussed the question for two or three years, as to the nature of the preferential arrangements which are now being carried out among the great self-governing Colonies, and in which we are invited to take a mutual part. No one has attempted to show exactly how to adjust their system so that every part of the British Empire to which they accorded preference shall receive exactly the same benefit. That is not the way in which Canada has proceeded. Canada has found certain concessions it can make, and it grants them to any self-governing Colony which will make reasonable concessions to her. She has also introduced a special Empire free list in which certain goods shall be admitted free provided they come from any portion of the British Empire. They offer such preference as they can give to any who come within the scope of it; and so shall we when the time comes. [Cries of "When?"] The man is short-sighted who thinks, because the opinion of the present House of Commons is averse from it, that the opinion of the electors on issues of which this was only one has been recorded in favour of the Government, the question is settled, and who fails to see at this moment that both at home and in the Colonies attention is concentrated upon it as it never was concentrated before, and that the question is likely to be an abiding question until we are able to settle it in this country in harmony with the general feeling of our race throughout the world. When that time comes the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day will be free from many difficulties which beset the right hon. Gentleman owing to the restrictions by which he has needlessly bound his hands. He will then be able to raise some portion of his revenue from the foreigners who use and take advantage of our markets, and instead of imposing taxation on articles of general consumption he will be able to raise a portion of it from articles of luxury, such as motor-cars, which may well contribute to our revenue. When those days come I cannot say what the demands of the public purse will be, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that time will be better equipped to meet them than is the right hon. Gentleman with all the abounding prosperity on which he congratulates us, and with the surplus of which he boasts. The right hon. Gentleman said that the income-tax may now be regarded as a permanent part of our fiscal system. I agree. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that we must deal with the anomalies in that tax which previous Chancellors of the Exchequer have justified themselves for disregarding on the ground that the tax was temporary. I am not aware, since Mr. Gladstone proposed in 1874 to abolish the income-tax, that any Chancellor of the Exchequer or any responsible politician ever thought it to be possible to abolish it altogether. It has been permanent since the decision of the country in 1874. The objection is not that the tax is permanent, but that it is permanent at a high rate, and all the right hon. Gentleman's predecessors, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Lowe, Lord Goschen, Sir M. Hicks Beach, and Sir Stafford Northcote, were of opinion that the real way to remove the intolerable hardship from the tax and to reduce its anomalies was not by attempting differentiation or graduation, but by restoring the income-tax to a low level. I deeply regret, after all the sacrifices which the income-taxpayers have been called upon to bear—including the sacrifice which I myself as Chancellor of the Exchequer was bound to impose upon them—the present Chancellor of the Exchequer should tell them, although he has a surplus, that there can be no kind of general relief. That is not bad news for the income-taxpayer only. It may be bad news for the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If you announce to the income-tax-payer, and especially to the large income-tax-payer, that you are going to keep the income-tax permanently at a 1s. in the pound——

MR. ASQUITH: I have not done so.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Well, if you draw such a picture of your financial future, the demands you have to meet, and the limitations which you have placed upon your power of raising revenue, the income-tax-payer need not be very clever to draw that inference, and I am afraid the result of your announcement will be the withdrawal of income from the area of taxation. Bear in mind, also, that if you induce people to withdraw part of their income or capital from the scope of the tax, it is not the poor man that will profit, but the rich man. I find that in the year 1904–5 the income derived in this country from foreign sources amounted to no less than £66,000,000. It would be no exaggeration to say that probably half of that amount could be withdrawn from the purview of the income-tax if the owners thought it worth while to do so. Undoubtedly there will be a tendency under a permanent high tax, first to divert capital abroad, and, secondly, to keep the interest on that capital abroad instead of bringing it home. Indeed, I do not think it is at all unlikely that before many years have passed the revenue will suffer to the extent of £1,000,000, £1,500,000, or even more per annum, from a movement of this kind. There is another point. The right hon. Gentleman, under cover of giving relief to a single class of income-tax-payer, is going to make the tax more inquisitorial all round. He is going to require from all employers a return of their employees with their rates of salary or wages.

MR. ASQUITH: Lord Ritchie's recommendations.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Very possibly it is right. Hitherto small incomes a little above the limit of exemption, paid in the form of weekly wages, have practically been exempt, not by law, but because the revenue authorities were unable to trace them. Now, at the moment that you are boasting of relieving the burden on small payers of income-tax, you are going to tax a vast body of workmen and clerks earning small salaries weekly, who have hitherto escaped.

MR. ASQUITH: Will the right hon. Gentleman say that they ought to escape?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not complain in the least of the interruption, but I say you are going to tax thousands who were not taxed before. Who are these people? They are people in fluctuating or uncertain employment. My answer to the right hon. Gentleman's question is that I think in applying to these people the income-tax in its full force, as it is applied to others, you are dealing out very hard measure to them, because of the very uncertain tenure of their employment and of the wages which they earn. It has been the practice till now to confine the income-tax to people whose appointment is by the year, and who, therefore, had a certain prospect before them. Now you are going to collect the tax from persons whose employment may be terminated at a week's or a day's notice. The precariousness of the employment is a good reason for the distinction; and I think the right hon. Gentleman is ill-advised, in the interest of the tax, in endeavouring to drag this class into his net. In fact, there is no remission of taxation; there is only a shifting of the burden. Is the right hon. Gentleman sure that it is any fairer? In regard to differentiation, he has shifted his ground from permanent and precarious to earned and unearned income. How does he justify his differentiation between earned and unearned? The right hon. Gentleman says that it is anomalous that A, who has £1,000 a year from Consols, and B, who earns £1,000 a year in a profession, should be taxed alike, because while A can spend the whole of his income, knowing that, should he die, his widow and children will still have £1,000 a year, B must put aside something to make a provision in the event of his death for his widow and children. That, surely, is based on the difference, not between earned and unearned, but between permanent and precarious. The moment the right hon. Gentleman puts his proposal on that ground he is bound to treat the income, not from the point of view whether it is due to personal exertion or not, but from the point of view whether the temporary possessor of it has the permanent disposal of it. Take the case of pensions. Is there anything more decidedly earned income than a pension, whether you look upon it as deferred pay or as an enforced provision for old age? A civil servant serves you during thirty or forty of the best years of his life, and you pay him a salary which may be more than adequate if he is a third-rate man, but below his value if he is a first-rate man; and, though I know from personal experience these men receive constantly the most tempting offers from the City or elsewhere, they prefer, quite apart from the honour of serving the State and the Crown, to remain in the service of the State because of the pension, which is part of the condition of their service. How can any Chancellor of the Exchequer for one moment say, differentiating between earned and unearned incomes, that a pension earned by forty years of service is unearned income? How can any Chancellor of the Exchequer for one moment say that it is right to differentiate between earned and unearned incomes and say that a pension earned by forty years' service is unearned income? There is no answer to that. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's answer was that he had an open mind. I think he said that after the discussion the other evening, and after observations such as I am now making, but I think in matters of this importance so intimately associated with the merit of the change, the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to have an answer of his own, at any rate a suggestion, to make at a very early stage, and before we part with this Resolution I think we ought to be told what are his general intentions in regard to these different questions. Take every kind of money charge, life annuities, younger sons' portions or a widow's endowment charge upon an estate. How will the Chancellor of the Exchequer apply his principle in those cases? Say an individual has £1,000 a year for life from any of those sources. Is he in the same position as the man who has £1,000 a year in Consols? No, Sir. Can he, in the first place, spend as freely from that thousand as the owner of Consols, if he has to put aside part of that income every year in order to provide for those who come after him because his income ceases with his life? The Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot draw the line which I understand he is trying to draw, without inflicting far greater hardship and creating far greater anomalies than any which exists under present arrangements. There is another class of income which has not been mentioned in our debates hitherto. How does he propose to treat incomes from patent rights? I make an invention, I patent it, and I am fortunate enough, we will assume, to have got hold of a really valuable commercial idea. I am offered £20,000 down for it, but I prefer to take royalties. When I take royalties, will the right hon. Gentleman treat my royalty as earned or unearned income? It is an annuity for fourteen years, during which period the patent will run. There is no fresh exertion on my part, there is one act of earning and one only, that of invention. How is the Chancellor of the Exchequer going to treat it, how is he going to treat my remuneration? Will he treat it differently whether I take it in annual payments as royalties or in a lump sum down? The moment you try to find an answer to this question you see how complicated and difficult is the distinction which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is trying to draw. If you treat it as earned during the fourteen years the patent has to run, will you give the same treatment to every wasting investment? You must give the same treatment to copyright, and to wasting assets in industrial concerns. If you treat the annual payment as earned you cannot logically deny the same treatment to the man who, instead of taking the annual payment, takes the lump sum and invests it. You can make a distinction between temporary and permanent income; but if you try to make a distinction between the two cases of earned and unearned income, you find you cannot do anything of the kind. Then again, what about leasehold? How does the right hon. Gentleman intend to treat incomes from investments in leasehold properties? It is a very common form of investment with people of very moderate means. What is he going to do with incomes from that source? If the Chancellor of the Exchequer justifies the distinction he has made, he must include all incomes from wasting securities like leasehold properties. I repeat my question, how is the right hon. Gentleman going to treat a landowner who manages his own estate, but does not farm it? Every morning my table is covered with letters from people who will have hard cases created by the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They ask me to ventilate their grievances or they come to me for sympathy which I attempt to give them. I have two cases here, one is that of a gentleman who writes to say that two years ago he gave up a salaried position in order to devote himself to the management of the estate which he owns, with a gross rental of a little over £1,000 a year. Supposing that man was earning £1,000 a year on somebody else's estate the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take from him an income-tax of 9d.; how is he going to treat him when he earns £1,000 from his own estate? [Laughter.] I really do not follow the reason for that laughter, and perhaps the hon. Member opposite will tell me how my question is ridiculous.

Sir T. P. WHITAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): The difference between the man who earns an income of £1,000 by rendering service, and the man who derives £1,000 from an estate which he manages is surely very evident. The one man is earning £1,000, the other is collecting income and the cost of doing it might be 2½ or 5 per cent.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have given more than one answer to the hon. Gentleman. I really want the Committee to take this case fairly into consideration. I put the case of a man who, being a land agent, earns his £1,000 a year in that capacity. He then inherits an estate, and having been trained as an estate agent, he proposes to manage his own estate and not to employ anybody to do it for him. In order to do that he has to give up a salaried position which he has occupied, and where he was taxed at 9d. I ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer how he is going to tax him when, instead of earning £1,000 for managing somebody else's estate, he earns £1,000 for managing his own? The hon. Member who interrupted implies that it would be equitable to tax him the full 1s. in the one case and 9d. in the other. The owner who manages his own estate fills the position of factor, agent, master of works, or estate manager, and if he, by managing his estate, earns £1,000 he does so by just as great personal exertion as many a shopkeeper or many a manufacturer, who makes a much greater income. How are you going to draw any distinction in equity between the two cases? Here is another case. A man writes to me and says that he is the owner of small property in town. He tells me that for his net income of nearly £2,000 a year he has to to collect rents of very nearly £4,000 a year gross. He has to go round to collect rents and interview tenants, giving up to the work five or six days a week in order to manage this small house property estate. How are you going to treat him? The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his reply the other day said that in such a case it would be for the individual to prove that the income arose from personal exertion. The Committee I hope, will not allow the measure to pass in that form, it would be grossly uujust. It would mean that it would leave to any Income-tax Commissioners or Board of Inland Revenue a width of discretion that would enable them to enforce an entirely different law in one part of the country from that prevailing in another, and an entirely different law in one class of circumstances from that prevailing in another, and I think that the Committee must decide what is fair and equitable in these circumstances. I do not want to weary the Committee with more detailed cases. I will make one general observation. Of course the right hon. Gentleman's £2,000 limit is wholly illogical, it is a matter of convenience on general grounds, and he is entitled to say that any man who has £2,000 a year does not need consideration, but on every ground of equity and logic, if the distinction between earned and unearned income is to be maintained I must enter my most serious protest against a proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer which, while nominally making a concession, withdraws about one-half of it with the other hand. He says that where a man has an income of less than £700, he is entitled to abatement upon that, and that the abatement will be taken from the earned portion of his income. I will take the position of a person with a small income of £300 a year, one of the people whom the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Members opposite desire to help. Suppose, as one of my correspondents says, £150 is derived from investments and £150 is annual salary. He is entitled to an abatement of £160 because his whole income does not exceed £300. You take the abatement off his earned portion and accordingly you deprive him of any benefit whatever under the concession which the right hon. Gentleman nominally makes to people with small earned incomes. There are not many cases so neat as that which I have just described, but there are a vast number of people who will be affected in that way, and who, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer persists for reasons of administrative convenience in taking the abatement off the earned portion of the income, will be deprived of any benefit from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's change, although they are the very class of people whom he wishes most to benefit. Then there is another question which is familiar to the House and which becomes of increasing importance as the Chancellor of the Exchequer modifies the incidence of the tax. Why are husband and wife to have their income lumped together for the purpose of income-tax? In the case of a husband with a very large income and a wife with a small income it may seem rather absurd to allow her an abatement when she enjoys the benefit of the husband's large income; but when you legislate to provide for that case you legislate for a bad case in such a way as to make bad law. For one case of that kind there are a thousand cases of the other kind, where you get a working man and working woman who up to the moment they marry are exempt from income-tax, and when they marry and are fulfilling the duties of good citizens, contributing, we may hope, to the strength and security of the State, you strike at them for the first time through the income-tax. The hardship became greater as abatement became a more important and permanent part of the system, and now, when, in addition to the abatement, you undertake to make a differentiation, it is a gross injustice to lump two small incomes together and treat them as one for the purpose of income-tax. I have said enough to show how difficult is the task on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has entered. I have heard his Budget described by a not unfriendly critic of his as a humdrum Budget. I have ventured to reply that no Budget is humdrum which attempts to differentiate between incomes derived from different sources. It is not what you would call a typical Radical Budget. It is a scheme intimately associated with the proposals of an hon. friend lately a Member of this side of the House, now temporarily excluded, Sir George Bartley, who year after year pressed them on successive Chancellors of the Exchequer, as Mr. Hubbard had done before him. It is not a Radical proposition; but it is a proposition which enormously complicates the tax. It not merely increases the complexity of your machinery, but it introduces a whole series of complicated problems which it is evident the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not attempted to solve, has not yet solved, is not yet willing to tell us how he proposes to solve.

Mr. ASQUITH: Why do you say that?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Because you said you were waiting till the close of this evening's debate before deciding.

Mr. ASQUITH was understood to say he had decided.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Chancellor of the Exchequer has got a decision in his mind. The Committee is entitled to have that decision announced to it at the earliest moment. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer knows how he is going to treat these different classes of property, and has a reasoned policy in regard to these points, surely we are entitled to know what that policy is without any further delay. I apologise to the Committee and thank them for their indulgence. These are matters in which I naturally take a very great interest. I looked carefully into the question of differentiation with no unsympathetic eye when Chancellor of the Exchequer; but, like so many of my predecessors, I abandoned it, not because I thought it in theory unjust, but because I thought it impossible to arrive at a practical working decision which would be fair as between party and party, and do what it was its object to achieve. What I concluded and what I now hold is that the only true remedy for all the anomalies and grievances of the income-tax is to get it back to a low figure and keep it at that low figure.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): The right hon. Gentleman has just made an interesting speech, and I do not think there will be any complaint on this side of the House as to the manner in which he has attempted to criticise the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But I do not think the complaint he makes is quite justified. He complains that our income-tax proposal will involve very great difficulties. Surely the right hon. Gentleman is aware that difficulties are inherent in the income-tax law and they exist to-day. The right hon. Gentleman's latest difficulty is that of husband and wife, but the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer when he was in office had that difficulty pressed upon him with great force by the hon. Member for Hammersmith, and of course he must be fairly familiar with it. That difficulty is not now increased. On the contrary, to a certain extent that difficulty will in the future be reduced, because if the joint income of husband and wife is less than £2,000 a year it will only be taxed as earned income to the extent of 9d. in the pound instead of 1s. As the right hon. Gentleman has not thought fit himself to remove the difficulty, he is no doubt familiar with the argument in defence of the present law on that point. He has asked about certain very minor matters. The right hon. Gentleman desires to know how the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to deal with the inventor who is receiving a royalty for his invention. The form in which the inventor receives payment is a deferred payment on sale. If he were paid so much money down for his invention he would naturally have to pay 1s. in the pound, because his invention would represent property and it would come under the property tax. For work done and paid for within the year a man with an income of less than £2,000 a year would have to pay 9d. in the pound. When income is derived from accumulated property, and not from something on which a man is working at the time, he pays on the property rate. The principle is perfectly clear. I do not think there will be much difficulty in dealing with royalties upon the same basis.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman say what he means by the same basis? Does he mean 1s. or 9d.?

MR. McKENNA: I mean 1s. in the pound. The right hon. Gentleman asks a question about the landlord working his own estate. The landowner is now dealt with under two schedules. Under Schedule A he pays 1s. in the pound, and he will continue under our new proposal to pay that amount. As a farmer the landlord although working his own property would pay under Schedule B, and he will continue to pay under that schedule, and if his total income is less than £2,000 a year he will pay 9d. in the pound. There is really no inherent difficulty in these cases, and they have to be treated as a matter of principle, and when that is done the difficulties will in practice disappear. The principle upon which the right hon. Gentleman has proceeded is to apportion the burden of the income-tax according to the ability to pay. Of course the exact proportion cannot be discovered by any Chancellor of the Exchequer, but what he says is that the present method of calculating the income-tax departs widely from that principle. It is said that income may be precarious whether derived from investment or from work. But under the present law precarious income in either case is treated alike. Although it may not be possible to distinguish between certain income from investment and precarious income from investment, we can at any rate distinguish the precarious incomes from work; and why should we be precluded from making a reduction in favour of the form of precarious income that is derived from work simply because it is impossible to distinguish between the certain income derived from investment in the funds and the less certain income derived from investment in a railway? There is this great distinction between the two classes of income—the man who is deriving his income from investment has not got to work for it, and the energy of his mind and hands can be devoted to some other form of exertion. If a man is deriving his income from funds or from railway companies so long as he derives it in that way he has got to pay 1s. in the pound. The man engaged in industry whether he labours with his hands or his mind is absorbing all his powers in earning and his income is specially precarious and he must take special pains to provide for his own future and that of his family. The ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer goes on to say that the true remedy is to reduce the amount of the tax. I could not help remembering when I listened to that statement that the last Chancellor of the Exchequer to increase the income-tax was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire himself. I agree with him that all taxation is disagreeable, and if the business of the nation could be conducted without an income-tax I am sure we should all be pleased to get rid of it. But the income-tax is necessary, and to argue that the best way to get rid of these anomalies is to reduce the tax when for the purposes of the year it is necessary to continue it, is asking the House to agree to a mere idle proposition and one which does not assist us in the discussion of this problem. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that if you left the tax at a shilling there would be danger of evasion. What is the experience on that point? There might be danger if the income-tax payers thought that they were being unjustly treated. I am certainly one of those who think that if you suddenly impose a very high rate of tax on a very limited class of persons that limited class would do the utmost in their power to evade the tax, but experience is altogether against the view that persons in this country would attempt to evade a tax of a shilling. The product of the tax is higher now than it has ever been before. The product of the tax was not reduced when the tax was increased to 1s. 3d. There is in this country no sense of unfairness with regard to the income-tax. Persons who have to pay it may grumble, but I have seen no criticism of the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer which suggests that it is unfair to reduce the rate of tax on those who have incomes of less than £2,000 a year which are obtained from work. He said that the amount of £2,000 might be increased. I have seen criticisms of that kind, but no criticism to the effect that rich persons would consider that they are treated unfairly by the reduction now made. When the right hon. Gentleman talks about capital, on account of an income-tax of a shilling, being transferred from this to other countries, I would ask him to name the other countries to which capital is to be transferred. If he looks across the Channel he will find that in France dividends are taxed not at 1s., but at 2s. in the £. If he turns to any country where there is a field for investment, he will find that the burden of taxation is at least as heavy as it is in this country, and so far as I can learn, instead of capital being removed from here and transferred abroad, the whole experience is exactly to the contrary. Foreigners invest money far more readily here than in their own countries. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the income-tax as a reserve for emergencies. I do not think he has fairly considered the present proposals as they affect the income-tax from that point of view. The income-tax, after all, is only at a shilling. In recent years it has been at 1s. 3d. in an emergency, and during wars previous to the last it has been at 2s. It cannot be held that a shilling represents the emergency limit. If it were increased to 2s., we should be able to derive an income of over £30,000,000—a provision for war far greater than any provision the country made during the course of the last war. How do the present proposals affect the income-tax as a reserve for emergency? What is the great resistance to an increase of the income-tax? The great resistance arises from those persons who are earning a difficult livelihood and who have to make provision for their wives and families and for their own old age. It is from the very persons who are now relieved by the reduction from 1s. to 9d. that the great resistance arises. The income-tax is now divided into two categories. There is the income-tax which may be described as a tax on property which is collected at the source. Then there is the portion which in the main falls under Schedule D—the income-tax which is difficult to collect and to increase. The division between the two categories renders the income-tax far more elastic than before, and when emergency requires the shilling could be increased to 1s. 3d., 1s. 6d., or 2s., as in our past history. There would be far less difficulty now than in the past when there was a uniform rate. The right hon. Gentleman complained that the Chancellor of the Exchequer contemplated no reduction in taxation generally. What are the facts as to the financial conduct of affairs during the last two years compared with the preceding two years when the right hon. Gentleman was himself a member of the Government in power? What has my right hon. friend done already? The coal tax has been abolished—a tax on industry. A reduction has been made in the tea tax. There has been a larger provision made for the repayment of Debt than ever before in the history of the country. More than that, he has taken on himself on the annual Estimates a charge which hitherto has been met out of loans, and he is now paying off, of the loans raised by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, on the Estimates, no less than £2,000,000 a year, in addition to the Sinking Fund of the National Debt. My right hon. friend has now reduced the income-tax where it fell most heavily. He has really in fact from the right hon. Gentleman's point of view acted at once in the most conservative manner, in restoring the credit of the country, and in repaying the Debt for which the right hon. Gentleman and his Party were responsible. He has at the same time reduced taxation in the manner I have described, and he has made definite provision for a social reform which was promised by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, but which was always refused on the ground that there was no money to meet it. What more could the Chancellor of the Exchequer do in two years? Is it reasonable to complain that he does not make any further reduction in taxation which the country at this moment can very well afford to bear. You cannot have it both ways. The right hon. Gentleman says that the

Chancellor of the Exchequer has his remedy. He says: "Widen the basis of taxation, and then you will be able to reduce taxation and find room for your other reforms." I can only say that it is somewhat late in the day for the right hon. Gentleman to come forward with any such proposal. He charges my right hon. friend with total and unpardonable ignorance of scientific tariffs. I must confess that I share that ignorance. Some years ago there was started with great pomp and ceremony a Commission which was to instruct us in the nature of scientific taxation. That Commission has held innumerable meetings. It has had many distinguished and experienced persons on its body. It has issued various Reports on various subjects, but not one word has it said on scientific tariffs. The whole object with which that Commission was appointed has failed, and we are still waiting for a scientific tariff. I am in total ignorance of what the right hon. Gentleman means by a scientific tariff as applied to this country. I know what he means as applied to Germany, but would the right hon. Gentleman translate the German tariff into the system of this country? If ignorance on this subject is unpardonable, it is not we who have to seek pardon. It is the Tariff Commission which has refused to enlighten us. I think I am justified in saying that the right hon. Gentleman makes a fundamental error when he argues about this country from the experience of other countries. I, for one, frankly state that I consider that other countries are mistaken in establishing their fiscal policy on a protective basis, but that is not the question for us to consider. What we have to consider is not what is done in Germany or the Colonies, but what is good for this country. The right hon. Gentleman has not made any suggestion as to what he considered would be a right tariff for us to adopt here. Whether in view of a protective policy, or a policy of Colonial preference, the suggestions of the right hon. Gentleman are purely fanciful. They have no basis either on experience or on any plan we can understand. What we have to go by in considering the right hon. Gentleman's proposal in the light of his speech, is the system we had under the right hon. Gentleman when Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the definite changes proposed to be made in that system now. I think I have said enough to show that the fears expressed with regard to the reduction of the income tax in certain cases from 1s. to 9d. are quite unjustified, and to dispose of the suggestions—for they were nothing more—that all that has been proposed by my right hon. friend, and far more, could be met by a protective tariff, the details of which have never been stated to us.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that in order that the debate might not be too long it would be necessary for every Member who spoke to confine himself to some particular portion of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He would not attempt to traverse the arguments of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. His purpose in rising was to put some questions to the Government and to examine the Budget from the point of view of the future finance of the country. His right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education had declared that the principle of the Government was the distribution of the burden between the taxpayers according to ability to pay. The general canon of ability to pay was applied to the income-tax in particular. The desire of himself and some of his friends was to make their position clear so far as the future was concerned as to the extent to which the Budget was based, or was likely to be based next year on the principle of ability to pay. There was no relief within this Budget, some of them thought, where relief might have been given. It had been shown to demonstration that there was over-taxation of those who were least able to pay, such as the agricultural labourers, as well as an insufficient weight of taxation thrown on those whose ability to pay was greatest. The right hon. Gentleman pointed, very justly, to the continued elasticity of the income-tax, to the increased utility of the income-tax as a war tax, as against the plans of the other side. The Report of the Committee had shown that they would be able at a time when they had public opinion behind them to raise money by a heavily graduated tax. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer had made the basis of his speech one which was likely to turn up in their debates all through the discussions on this Budget. When the Liberal Party wanted to have debates on tariff reform at a time when they might have been useful for the enlightenment of the country they never could get them. It would be a pity now to waste all their time with sterile discussions of tariff reform when they might be discussing the Budget proposals. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to base his view on a greater productiveness of our fiscal system which would enable us to have a low income-tax, and to tax the foreigner. But let them take the nearest protectionist countries—France and Prussia. France raised a larger proportion of her revenue from direct taxation than Great Britain did; and other taxes in the nature of an income-tax which French statesmen were now trying to raise were much heavier than ours. In Prussia they had a 2s. income-tax—1s. for Imperial purposes, and 1s. for local purposes. But it would be found that the adoption of such tariffs as theirs did not reduce their contributions to the income-tax. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer made another remark which was directed against the Budget as a whole for this year and that for next year, to which he wished to make an allusion before he came to the present Budget itself. They all on the Ministerial side of the House rejected the view that in dealing with old age pensions the Government should adopt the plan recommended by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. They thought that the arguments adduced against the thrift and contributory plan were overwhelming. On the other hand that rejection was important, because of the great expense involved by it. He himself would offer the most uncompromising resistance to a scheme of old age pensions based on thrift and contributions, and would fight it to the death, because it would be monstrously unjust against the poorer classes of men and women workers. That was a remark by the way; but he wished to put it on record in view of what might take place next year. He did not want to deal with the Budget as a whole; but one remark he wished to make arose out of what he had said as to the equality of contribution. He thought that those who contributed the most according to their means, the agricultural labourers, did not receive the relief which they ought to have. His right hon. friend had said that they could not touch the sugar duties this year for reasons which might possibly be misunderstood abroad. He would, therefore, note that he assumed that the Government were going to act on their pledge to denounce the Sugar Convention at the earliest possible moment. But when considering a Budget for two years he was very much afraid that the argument put forward by his right hon. friend might affect his power of dealing with sugar next year. He must enter a caveat against the proposition that the House of Commons was committed to the idea that duties on articles of consumption by the poorer classes and by agricultural labourers were to be continued for all time. They were all delighted that his right hon. friend was going to deal with the intercepted revenue for local taxation. At the same time, he would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman one or two questions. The right hon. Gentleman's argument was that his desire was to free the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and that rather looked as though in any future development of new sources of taxation, these would be treated as Imperial and not as for the benefit of the local authorities.

MR. ASQUITH said that no one was more strongly opposed to that than himself.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that it was assumed by some that, before the matter could be settled, it was necessary to wait until the question of valuation should be dealt with. His own difficulty concerned not valuations but boundaries. If the urban authorities were to be given new sources of taxation the present boundaries could not stand, and, therefore, the control of the Chancellor of the Exchequer or some one representing the whole country would be requisite. It was quite clear that by this Budget they were not committing themselves on that point; and it was to be hoped that new sources of local taxation might be discovered. As the alternative was the use of the income-tax by localities, he pointed out that all other countries were throwing local taxation on the income-tax. In this country they must contemplate a heavy income-tax for local purposes or discover new sources of taxation. He now came to the income-tax in the Budget of this year. His right hon. friend had told the Committee that the Select Committee were unanimously in favour of upholding the necessity of the differentiation he had proposed. That was going rather far, though strictly speaking that was so. Some people came to differentiation as the main thing they wanted; other people who wanted graduation only came very reluctantly to differentiation. He admitted freely that the description that the hon. Member for Spen Valley had given of what had occurred was that the Report of the Select Committee did not accurately represent the opinion of any one Member of the Committee; while the hon. Member for East Edinburgh said that the Report was not logical; it was the result of discordant views, and that that was the reason why it was accepted. That was a little like the case of the Thirty-Nine Articles. It was difficult to say whether the Puritan majority of the House or the Bishops disliked those Articles most in the time of Queen Elizabeth, but they were accepted. Paragraph 13 of the Report of the Select Committee said that it was not desirable that the total revenue to be derived from their income-tax should be less than under existing circumstances, and that the tax should be raised in other directions to compensate for any loss. His right hon. friend was extending the principle of declaration. At the present moment all those with an income below £700 a year, who were in the vast majority, had to make a full declaration in order to get the benefit of the reduction. The right hon. Gentleman called upon others to do that which some did now, which the London newspapers did now, namely, to return the wages of all employeés, yet in some cases they were not to return their own income if it was above £2,000 a year. The recommendations of the Committee were contradictory and were not clear. The words used on two pages of the Report were not the same, and one of those recommendations was carried only by his casting vote. The recommendation of the Committee of 1905–1906 was repeated by the unanimous recommendation of his Committee. That was not enough for many of them. As many as seven voted for the strongest possible reform, so that nearly half were in favour of the fullest possible return for income-tax in the country. Was there anything to be said against that? He admitted it might be difficult to obtain these full and free returns if it was for the purpose of increasing a man's taxation; but for the purpose of obtaining relief these declarations might easily be required. It was suggested that there was evasion at the present time on the part of some of those who returned income under Schedule D, and they felt the effect of those evasions, of which all in their individual capacity were aware. He was not going to allude to the formidable evidence enforcing the necessity for universal declarations which came before his Committee and was not allowed to be published, but let them take the evidence published by the former Committee of 1905–1906. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that if they had a high income-tax or even continued it permanently at a shilling there would be evasion; but was there no evasion now? The Chancellor of the Exchequer put very high the advantage which they obtained by collection at the source, but no one desired to part with collection at the source. It was not necessary for graduation to part with collection at the source. He, for one, only agreed to differentiate, as it was proposed in this year, if it was to be confined to incomes in the lower portion of the scale. The hon. Member for Paddington contended that the death duties ought not to be connected with income-tax, but though there were cases in which they were not connected, there were others where both income-tax and death duties pressed in an equal degree, and there were cases in which they were connected. It had been shown beyond dispute that the power of getting income-tax by death duties was least in the lower scale. There was some ground, therefore, for treating differentially the incomes below £2,000. Many of them had yielded to differentiation below the £2,000, with all its difficulties, and they were great; they had yielded, as they would not yield in the upper portion of the scale, because there graduation and differentiation came into competition; and it was graduation many of them wanted. There had been some attempt to put the individual case, but it was useless to fight long on the individual case, because it was quite possible to find great hardships in individual cases in every tax that had ever been imposed. Up to the present the difficulty had been looked at either from that point of view or from the point of view that there was a risk of creating greater injustice. In 1894 Sir William Harcourt, one of those Chancellors of the Exchequer who always refused to accept differentiation, quoted these words—

> "Unequal measure must be dealt to persons whose circumstances are equal, and equal measure must be dealt to persons whose circumstances are unequal."

They were those of Sir Stafford Northcote, accepted by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe, who all thought that there was a risk of creating greater injustice than existed at present. There was ground, he thought, for differentiation provided it was understood that differentiation was not to be extended as graduation might be extended, to the upper portion of the scale. Sir H. Primrose yielded to differentiation; he showed conclusively that the machinery of the department did not adapt itself to the distinction based upon the nature of precarious incomes, and therefore if they were to differentiate it must be on the basis which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had adopted and not upon that of the precarious nature of incomes. They should put in some words of caution to prevent differentiation being brought in over £2,000, and to prevent graduation being ruled out, and he desired to make it clear that some of them could only accept differentiation on that principle. The Report of the Committee of 1905 made it clear why some of them denied universal deductions. It said—

> "There are many kinds of income to which this system of assessment at the source can not be applied at all, or can only be very imperfectly applied, as for instance, the profits derived from a private business, the income derived from a profession, and certain descriptions of income derived from abroad. In order to ascertain these incomes the Government has to rely largely upon self-assessment by the taxpayer. Unfortunately, there is abundant evidence to show that in the sphere in which self-assessment is still requisite, there is a substantial amount of fraud and evasion."

What was the evidence of Sir Thomas Hewitt? He was asked whether it would not be an improvement to compel everybody to make a return, and he agreed. He was then asked, "You are of opinion that evasions are extending considerably," and he said, "Yes I know it is so. I can speak absolutely and positively." They must also remember what was said by Sir Felix Schuster, that the belief people had in their minds was that the Government collected everything at the source. That very fact tended to defeat the object of assessment at the source, and to prevent people remembering to make a return in the case where money came to them from abroad. There were many rich people who did not know whether the tax was paid upon such incomes or not, and so easy-going people would fill up *nil* upon the form without inquiry. Sir T. Hewitt had called attention to the fact that, according to a case which had been decided, the Government had very considerable powers now of forcing people to produce their accounts. They heard a good deal about the inquisitorial character of the tax, but that inquisitorial character was only in order to make all people do what most people did—make a fair and honest return. Those people who did not pay upon a fair and honest return ought to be made to do so, for otherwise the honest people had to pay more. It had been shown that a startling amount of back duty was recovered at the present time, a very small proportion of which was treble duty, but referred almost entirely to evasions under Schedule D. There were, however, other schedules besides Schedule D which were the subject of evasion. Looking at the evidence showing the enormous evasion of the income-tax and the easy way in which people failed to make any return of their dutiable property on the ground that other people did the same, he thought that not too much ought to be made of the boast that virtually the whole of the tax was gathered at the source. Those who had looked into the subject were aware of the enormous amount of property that escaped the payment of income-tax at present, and a great deal of the tax would be gathered if precautions were taken to see that everyone made a declaration of his income from every source. But that end could only be attained by frankly accepting what was called an inquisition as to the amount of income derived from all sources. It had been suggested that graduation, an increase of the death duties, and inquisitorial declarations would result in the flight of capital from this country. To what country was capital to go? The death duties were being increased in Germany and France, and indeed it was a race among foreign Powers as to whose death duties should be placed at the highest point in respect of great properties. But surely it was desirable to consider whether causes other than the amount of the income-tax did not eventually settle the ultimate destination of capital. In Monaco, for example, there was no taxation; in France direct taxation was the highest in the world; but no one had ever detected the flight of anyone to Monaco in order to escape taxation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) submitted that there had been cases of the flight of capital from France to Switzerland and from France to the United States.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that there was a fashion in these things in France confined for the most part to the idle rich, but not found among the business people. There could hardly be a fear of the income-tax in France, where, by the showing of M. Poincaré, the average income-tax, under other names, was already for national purposes, nearly 8½ per cent. There was a wish to see a heavy income-tax shifted and placed on a reasonable basis; but the moving of capital from France through the fear that another tax would be introduced was not a tenable view. The evidence available, at any rate, did not provide justification for the view of timidity with regard to the shifting of capital from land to land. He admitted that it would be difficult to collect a large amount of money here by means of a graduated super-tax against the will of the trading community, though by means of degression a much larger sum of money might be collected from the income-tax than was now procurable without the fear of causing capital to flow into other countries. The main ground on which he supported the Budget of this year was that it kept the door open, and that not a word had been said which made it difficult in the future to adopt the principle of graduation within the income-tax itself. He hoped that his right hon. friend would see his way to do something to meet the fears that he had expressed as to the future. They could not contemplate even the spending of £20,000,000 on old age pensions if it involved keeping up permanently such enormous indirect taxation as now existed, for example, on the agricultural classes. In addition to the tea duty, there was the sugar duty, which was a very serious hindrance to the industry of the country; and when they looked at the nature of the tobacco duties, how they pressed heavily on the tobacco consumed by the poorest of the poor, and the beer and licensing duties, it was assuredly difficult to justify the permanent retention of indirect taxation on such a scale. In the circumstances of this year his right hon. friend was justified in the course he had taken, but next year he hoped that something might be done to meet the views that he had urged.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to a great extent underrated his opportunity, and the resources available to him, for dealing with the sugar duty this year. If he were before them with a clean slate, he would have a surplus, on the basis of existing taxation, of £3,433,000, and if he added the £600,000 increased estate duty he would have £4,033,000. Taking that as his clean slate, and after providing £200,000 for necessitous schools, he calculated that if the right hon. Gentleman made no further proposals, he would this year have a surplus of £4,583,000, and next year of £5,183,000. These figures would enable Mr. Asquith this year to take 2s. 2d. per cwt. off sugar, leaving the tax at 2s., or next year to take off 3s. 2d., and leave the tax at 1s. There was another alternative. It must be borne in mind that sugar was the raw material of important British industries. The right hon. Gentleman might give a rebate on sugar used for the purposes of manufacture, either of confectionery or of mineral waters, or of other commodities. In that way he would give the sugar manufacturers no greater advantage than was now enjoyed by the manufacturers of tobacco in this country, who paid on their raw material a duty of 3s., while the importer of manufactured tobacco had to pay as much as 6s. This concession would enable British manufacturers to supply the consumer at lower prices than if the Chancellor of the Exchequer made a small remission on all imports of sugar. As had been pointed out, the danger was that this Budget was to be connected with a future series of Budgets, and there was a chance that the question of the sugar tax might be altogether drowned out by the magnitude of other questions. The right hon. Gentleman had used two sentences in his speech to which he would draw special attention. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I intend to treat the income-tax as a permanent part of our fiscal machinery,"

and he also said—

> "I cannot part with the one million and a half of money. I shall need the money for the future; I shall need it next year."

It was not out of any absolute unkindness to the right hon. Gentleman or from any malicious intention that he dwelt upon the personal pronoun "I," which was the nominative case of these interesting paragraphs. It was necessary to make this reference in order to remind the Committee of the object in view. It might be perfectly right to aim at continuity in these Budgets, but that did not mean that the right hon. Gentleman had any right to issue promissory notes to embarrass his successors. How did the Chancellor of the Exchequer know that it would be he, or even a colleague of his, that would have to deal next year with the £1,500,000 that he pretended thus to pledge in advance? That observation applied to both the right hon. Gentleman's proposals as to income-tax and old age pensions. For the life of him he could not see why the Chancellor of the Exchequer stopped the differentiation at incomes above £2,000 a year. It might be that the Select Committee had recommended some such limit, but with the utmost respect to that Committee, he could not find that there was anything about it contained in the reference to them. It was really not a question connected with practicability; they did not say it was a question connected with practicability, and the evidence did not show that it was connected with practicability. It was really a question which ought to be settled by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the House itself without reference to any Committee. The fundamental distinction was that the capital value of the asset taxed was not the same, and that disparity applied throughout the whole scale. He knew what was in the minds of the Committee, and in the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. What weighed upon their minds was the bugbear of the too prosperous brewer, the man who got so rich that they had to disregard the fact that it was by his personal exertions that he was making money. But the mere fact of the brewer's riches was no argument except in the case where the very success which had produced the riches had also, by creating a good-will, given permanency to the income; and, in that case, the claim to differentiation disappeared. The true distinction was not between earned and unearned income, but between temporary and continuing income—continuing, that is, independently of the life of the recipient.. In the case of temporary income, they ought not to stop at £2,000 a year, in giving the advantage of differentiation, because however rich the recipient might be, the income died with him, or ceased when his personal capacity to earn it ceased. Its permanency should not depend upon its magnitude; it depended on the earning capacity of the individual himself. A continuing income might be an earned income, but yet not deserve the favour of a differentiated rate. To tax the temporary income on the higher scale, though temporary, and only because it was large, was really to introduce graduation without having the honesty to say so. One advantage of differentiation over the whole scale, that was to say above £2,000, was that they would get the full declaration of income from all except those who had no temporary income at all. In connection with the two paragraphs which he had quoted from the right hon. Gentleman's speech, he had also to consider the proposal with regard to old age pensions. Before they made promises about old age pensions two things had to be said. They ought not to promise old age pensions unless and until they could actually appropriate money to answer them. The Committee would observe that he used the word "until" as well as "unless." His second proposition was that they ought not to appropriate for old age pensions money got by reductions of the Navy. He was old-fashioned enough to believe that money got by reductions of the Navy ought to be disposed of either by remission of taxation, or by payment of Debt. Only in that way could we preserve our defensive power. If they remitted taxation, they restored the money to fructify in the pockets of the people, with the certainty that if they called for it again, in order to increase our naval strength—and who could say that they would never need to do that ?—they would only be laying on the people burdens that experience had already shown they could bear. If, on the other hand, they used the money to pay off Debt, they were creating in advance the best of all possible war chests against future naval attacks, the mere knowledge of the existence of which, in the minds of any whom it might concern, would be the best conceivable security that no such attack would be adventured. But if they pledged for ever, for old age pensions, or for any other perpetual or irrevocable charge, money saved by reducing the Navy, they would not be able, in case of need, to bring the Navy to its former strength without putting on new taxes, or raising the rate of old ones. He onfessed that he shared the uneasiness of his right hon. friend the Member for East Worcestershire, that the Budget meant that the income-tax was not only to be a permanent institution, but was also to be maintained at the present or even a higher rate; also, that it was to be administered in an increasingly inquisitorial way. In the scheme of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, they were getting further and further away from the policy of making the same people find the money for the public service who spent the money. That was why he did not think that the Budget tended very much in the direction either of justice or of economy.

*SIR T. P. WHITTAKER said he regarded the Budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as one of the soundest and most courageous he had listened to since he had been a Member of the House. The speech of the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer proved that it was a strong Budget. The Opposition seemed troubled at the idea that the income-tax was likely to be a permanent one at a shilling. It was quite true that the Chancellor did not say it would be kept permanently at that figure, but he did say that the income-tax would be permanent. Some of them, he might say, had arrived at that conclusion twenty-five years ago. After the experience they had had of Tory finance, the way in which the late Government piled up the debt of the country, and the cost of the Army and Navy, it might be expected that the income-tax would be high. Having separated earned from unearned income the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to raise one portion altogether independently of the other. At times of national emergency, it would be much easier to raise the 1s. income-tax than it would have been if that tax involved those earning smaller incomes as was the case at present. He did not share the fears which had been expressed on this point. The ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that he was afraid the effect of the change would be that money would be invested abroad, and that incomes would go there as well. He did think any trouble would arise from foreign investments, because they would only suffer if the income from those investments did not come back to this country, and those likely to invest such incomes abroad were very few indeed. As a rule the men who inherited their wealth lived pretty well up to their incomes. The man who invested large sums of money abroad was generally the man who was making money pretty freely, namely the great business man. He was not the man who would be likely to invest his income abroad simply because there was a heavier income-tax placed upon it in this country. He could do far better with it in his own business concerns here. The right hon. Gentleman opposite seemed very much troubled about the returns being demanded from employers stating the salaries they paid. That simply amounted to this—that because a number of people who ought to pay did not pay but evaded payment, he thought it was a great pity that the law should be made effective. He did not think any sufficient reason could be given why he should sympathise more with the working man earning £180 a year than he did with the clerk earning the same sum, and if the clerk paid income-tax he thought the working man ought to pay also. It was rather a curious argument to object to a change the aim of which was to make the law more strict. Under the present law a great many evaded the tax altogether, and the right hon. Gentleman thought they ought not to be made to pay. He did not think that was the way to deal with the position. If it was thought that wage earners ought not to pay income-tax, then by all means let the

House alter the law in that direction. He thought this provision for getting a return from the employers might deal to a limited extent with working men, but it would also deal with a large class who were earning considerably more than £160, but did not pay income-tax because they were difficult to get at. Surely it was only good business that they should ascertain from employers what were the incomes of those they employed in order that they might be taxed accordingly. The right hon. Gentlemen the Member for the Forest of Dean defended the use of the phrase "earned and unearned" as distinguished from "permanent and precarious." He thought the former was much the better term. It was quite true that there were difficulties and differences in regard to incomes which were derived from annuities, leaseholds and mining securities, as compared with incomes derived from Consols and other high class securities. We were, however, a practical people. Parliament had to go on definite lines, and they could not go into endless distinctions. There was a clear distinction between earned incomes and those derived from investments, whether precarious and permanent or not. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire had given as an illustration the case of a gentleman who followed the business of an estate steward and received £1,000 a year for managing an estate. That estate must have been bringing in considerably more than £1,000 a year, because no landlord would pay £1,000 a year to a steward unless the income was very large. According to the illustration that steward gave up his position and managed an estate of his own which brought him in £1,000 a year, and it was contended that it would be unjust to tax such an income on the higher scale. The suggestion was, of course, that both positions were the same, and that in each case the income was earned. But such was not the case. The management of his own estate might occupy only a very small proportion of his time, and therefore his income would be derived not so much from actual work, but from property left to him, and surely there was all the difference in the world between the two cases. Then the right hon. Gentleman seemed very much troubled about the person deriving his income from a lot of small property, and suggested that on an estate worth £2,000 a year the amount collected in rents, rates, and taxes might amount to £4,000 a year. In such a case the rates and taxes would be deducted, and there would also be a strong case for deducting the cost of collection. The balance would be income from the property, and in no sense earned income, and he would only be taxed on his net income. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had expressed an opinion in favour of graduation by degression. That meant that if they fixed a maximum tax of 4s. in the pound on incomes of £40,000 a year, and everybody below that was to pay less than that maximum, they would be obliged to collect the maximum tax from everybody, and then return to everybody, except 250 millionaires, some portion of the tax In some cases they would have to return 3s. 11d. out of the 4s. He thought that system a cumbersome and impracticable method, because it meant taking from the people tens of millions of money, holding it for a considerable time, and then returning it. His opinion was that if they were to graduate the rate of tax on large incomes it would have to be done by a super-tax. In regard to differentiation it had been said that £2,000 was an arbitrary figure. And so it was. If they selected any limit at all it would be arbitrary, but it did not follow that it would be undesirable. Some of them no doubt would have preferred to carry the differentiation further, but there were many difficulties in the way. At the present time there was no difficulty whatever in dealing with professional incomes like those obtained by lawyers, architects and others, because they were very simple. A salary was an earned income, and he thought they would all agree that they included amongst earned incomes the incomes of the small traders. They could not argue that the small shopkeeper did not earn his income, but in his case they had to take into consideration the capital invested in his business, and that was not quite the same thing as a salary. The difficulty was that the higher the scale went and the larger the income from a trade or business the greater would be the element of capital. The man making a large income from a business often had a large amount of capital in it. Consequently it became very difficult, unless they were prepared to call upon men in business to return the amount of their capital and make an allowance for the capital, deducting it from the total income, and treating the balance as earned income. That system would be complicated and difficult, whereas, as a matter of rough justice, if they took £2,000 as the limit—he was quite willing to go up to £3,000—they would be dealing with incomes which were very largely earned. If they went right through the scale beyond £2,000 they would find themselves landed in very great difficulties. Let them take, for example, the case of the Rothschilds. They were in business and they earned their incomes, but they all knew that those incomes were also very largely a return upon capital. If they were to include all traders as earning their income they would have to include such people as the Rothschilds, and it was absurd to argue that the Rothschilds should pay at a lower rate than a widow with a large family who had been left £750 a year which she derived from investments. In the case of a successful barrister earning from £5,000 to £10,000 a year he thought it would look a little anomalous if he were to pay income tax of 9d. while a widow with children had to pay 1s. He did not care which way they went, they would have anomalies and difficulties, but on the whole the limit of £2,000 would work fairly well. All they could do was to decide on broad lines and then do substantial justice. Any scheme would lend itself to detailed and carping criticism. After all, the object of taxation was to get money, and it must be got in substantial sums. Little fiddling distinctions were a nuisance. They cost more in collecting than they were worth. The Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted money in a lump. A considerable difficulty arose from the case of limited liability companies. Many small traders formed their businesses into companies, for family and personal reasons, and they derived an income from them which, if a private income, would entitle them to come in under a lower scale. He did not know what the Chancellor of the Exchequer's decision on that might be, but his own view was that they would have to charge the incomes from companies as incomes from investments. He was afraid they could not go into details and separate earned from unearned incomes there, and he thought that view might be justified on the broad ground that, if men took advantage of the law to place themselves in a special position for particular purposes of their own, they must consider this extra rate as part of the price they paid for occupying that position. There was a point to which, as he happened to have personal knowledge in regard to it, he would like to draw the attention of the Government namely, that at the present time a great many people who borrowed money and paid interest upon it deducted the income-tax from the interest. A very large number of those people had incomes under £700, and did not pay the 1s. rate of tax; but they always deducted the 1s. It did not matter to the man who received the interest, but it was lost to the public revenue. That applied very largely to insurance companies. That difficulty was going to be accentuated by the new differentiation. It was not for him to suggest a way out of the difficulty. It was a point which ought to be dealt with, because it might cause a leakage in the revenue. With regard to the death duties, he thought the increase which had been made was a most equitable and desirable one, and the only complaint which he made was that it was very modest. He saw no reason why the increased rate should only come on after the first £1,000,000. Why should it not apply to the whole estate and not only after passing the first £1,000,000? As he understood the proposal it was that the rate was to be 10 per cent. on an estate of £1,000,000, and if a man left £1,500,000, the rate was to be 10 per cent. on £1,000,000 and 11 per cent. on £500,000. He did not see any reason why it should not be 11 per cent. on the full amount. As to the reduction of Debt, that was where he thought this was a courageous Budget. Nothing paid better than paying off Debt. The recent fall of securities was largely owing to the great increase in national expenditure. The figures showed that the national expenditure raised by taxes in the ten years between 1887 and 1896 was £784,000,000, while the amount in the ten years between 1897 and 1906—the latest decennial period for which the figures were available—was £1,286,000,000, an increase of about £500,000,000. The expenditure by local authorities in the United Kingdom in the ten years from 1884 to 1893 was £691,000,000. In the ten years from 1894 to 1903 the amount was £1,181,000,000, an increase of £500,000,000, or nearly double. [AN HON. MEMBER: All the better.] Was it all the better? Most wise people arranged their expenditure according to their means. The result was a great fall in the value of securities, amounting to at least another £500,000,000. What did that mean? He was not expressing any opinion as to the wisdom of any particular capital expenditure. This fall in the value of securities meant that the available capital of the nation was £1,500,000,000 less. [Cries of "Not at all," and "It is largely productive."] Yes, it was £1,500,000,000 less capital available for investment and use in trade. The issue of Consols and Government stock, and the increased trade produced an increased demand for money from the market already depleted to the extent of that £1,500,000,000; therefore the price of money went up, and every municipality was suffering because they had to pay more for their money. And therefore he rejoiced that the Chancellor was going in for improving the national credit. Many Members were returned to that House with a great cry for economy, but he found that a great many of them were voicing a good many demands for expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman opposite said that the working and consuming taxpayer must pay for social reform, and he understood that that was a reproach. He thought, however, that it did not lie with the right hon. Gentleman to reproach this Government with anything in that direction, because he proposed to raise the revenue by taxes on imports, which would be taxes on the working and consuming citizen. The right hon. Gentleman preferred a contributory scheme of old age pensions, but he thought he would find it would be extremely difficult, costly, and almost impracticable to carry out such a scheme. The difficulty of getting any contribution at all from the poorest and least settled section of the community would be almost insuperable. Reference had been made to the taxes on sugar and tea, but he would point out that there was a great difference between that kind of taxes and the kind of taxes which the right hon. Gentleman advocated. He himself did not like the tax on sugar, but, at any rate, it was a tax on the whole article. If, however, a tax were put on only the wheat and corn which came from foreign countries, leaving wheat and corn from the Colonies and British possessions to come in free, it meant that the price of the whole wheat and corn consumed in this country would be increased, while a revenue would be obtained from only a very small portion. Another thing was that, if they were to look forward to anything like a satisfactory scheme of old age pensions and other social reforms, they would want a very considerable revenue. He remembered the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham admitting that he would never have gone into the question of tariff reform but for the purpose of gaining revenue for old age pensions. At the same time they were told that we were to be a self-contained Empire, and that only foreign wheat and corn and manufactured goods were to be taxed. He could not help wondering where the money for old age pensions was to come from when we became self-contained and imported no corn on which tax was paid. It was said that there was to be no tax on raw material; but had the right hon. Gentleman opposite considered the difficulty of finding out what a raw material was? Steel plates and bar iron were the raw materials for making machinery; leather was a manufactured article of the currier, but the raw material of the shoemaker; dyes and chemicals were manufactured articles, but the raw material of the dyer and manufacturer of many articles. Were all these things to be taxed? It seemed to him that the Budget was a sound and courageous one. As he had said, if they were to look forward to anything like a satisfactory scheme of old-age pensions, they would want a very considerable revenue, and while he did not agree as to what was meant by a contributory policy, he thought they ought to look for contributions through taxation towards those pensions from all classes of the community in proportion to their means.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said he quite agreed with what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, that it was necessary for them to some extent to limit their remarks; and he proposed to address the Committee in that sense. The three most prominent features of the Budget were:—first, the establishment of the income-tax as a permanent part of our fiscal system; secondly, the determination to increase the death duties upon those who were too few to unite in resistance; and thirdly, the non-interference with indirect taxation, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted he could not afford. These three points showed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a nervous feeling that he had come to the end of his resources. He could not but think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal to make a permanent 1s. income-tax—for that was what it came to, although he demurred officially to the simple statement—was a very dangerous departure. They had heard over and over again what were the economic objections to an income tax at all, and that it could only be defended as an emergency tax. They knew that it was a tax on capital, and in that respect paralysed enterprise, and affected wages. The most eminent statisticians, such as Sir Robert Giffen, were insistent upon relieving it. Mr. Gladstone himself had repeatedly condemned it in emphatic words, as a dangerous, vexatious, and demoralising tax, which affected the trade and industry of the country more than any other; and yet, that was the tax which the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to impose on the country as a permanent tax! What was going to happen in the event of an emergency arising? Was it to be increased to 1s. 6d. in the pound and proportionately to 1s. 3d. in the pound to those whose incomes were under £2,000 a year? If so, that was a very serious outlook for the country. War was not the only emergency which might arise. For instance, if the cost of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme for old age pensions was under-estimated, as it easily might be, an emergency might arise ten or fifteen years after it came into operation which would necessitate the provision of large additional funds, and it would be very undesirable that the whole of these should come out of the income-tax. It would dislocate the industries of the country. He did not think hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches properly appreciated how strong also was the sense of injustice that many people might feel in regard to the increase of that tax, and in consequence he was not at all sure that it would not be evaded even with the reduction on earned incomes which was proposed. It would certainly be evaded from that sense of injustice if it were to be raised to 1s. 6d. or 2s. whenever there was an emergency. The President of the Board of Education had said that he could not see how it could effectually be evaded. His information had been drawn from reading the Report of the Select Committee, in which Sir Henry Primrose had pointed out that it would not be at all difficult for people to evade the tax. The evidence pointed to the probability that people here would transfer their capital to other countries, would transfer their property to their children in their lifetime, and that the revenue from their investments abroad would be remitted to them direct instead of through their bankers. The President of the Board of Education asked to what countries they could transfer their capital and not be subject to income-tax. He would suggest the principality of Monaco, Canada, or the United States, and he really did not see what there was to prevent people who were so minded from transferring a large portion of their property from this country to other parts of the world, and thus not only evade any increase of the income-tax, but also the 1s. in the pound they were paying at the present time. The proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be likely to frighten away the people who had been described as "the idle rich," the very people whom he desired to catch, and they would evade the tax. Moreover, rich people would also take into account the death duties—which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was increasingly—as part of the gross taxation they paid, and that also would influence them. There was some evidence before the House that the taxation of this country, taking the income-tax and the death duties together, was probably higher, certainly as high, as that of any other country. At any rate he read with considerable interest the evidence of Mr. Bernard Mallet, who had made a special study of income-tax in this and other countries, and had arrived at the conclusion that the effect of our present system as to combination of the death duties and income-tax was already practically equal in severity, for differentiation, to that in force in any foreign country or colony. If that was so, was it surprising that people should take the course referred to in the evidence of Sir Felix Schuster, who said that certain investors had to his knowledge made inquiries in regard to, and had already placed investments in the hands of bankers in New York and Paris. That meant that there was a tendency to evasion already manifesting itself among certain income-tax payers. It appeared to him from the evidence of experts who were acquainted with the subject, therefore, that it was far from certain that the Government would not lose as much as they gained by putting on an increased income-tax, as they would frighten away the very people out of whom they wished to get the money, and they would find the money they wished to secure slip through their fingers. Of course, the real question was the point at which they would resist, and he said in his humble judgment that the point of resistance had been reached now that the proposals of the Government had been put forward. If the Committee thought differently he could only say they must wait and see what occurred in the future. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had drawn a distinction between earned and unearned income, but he doubted whether that distinction would be received quite so popularly as the right hon. Gentleman was disposed to believe. At all events, he had had one or two very interesting letters from his constituents upon the subject, and they could certainly not be called millionaires. He thought that the small tradesman and employee viewed the question from a standpoint which had not been sufficiently discussed in the House. In a letter which had reached him two days previously it was said—

> "A man or woman may work hard for thirty or forty years, save a little money, and invest it, and then just in their declining years they are to be taxed far more than the young, strong, and healthy man who is able to work."

He was sure that there was a widespread feeling in the country that the Government were going to tax incomes from investments with that result. He thought the distinction which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made between earned and unearned income was an unfortunate one from that point of view and was not likely to be popular. He considered that the Chancellor of the Exchequer by requiring a compulsory declaration of income from men with incomes of over £2,000 a year would lose the co-operation of that class. There was nothing that an Englishman resented so much as prying into his private affairs for a purpose which he did not consider necessary, and he did not think that any man would calmly sit down to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or anyone else, a full and complete declaration of his income from all sources when it would not benefit him in any way and was only made in an inquisitorial manner for the purpose of taxing him more highly in the future. He thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, therefore, would find that his arrow had been shot in vain. He approved, however, of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals for the reduction of Debt, as he thought they were statesmanlike and excellent, and he also approved of his proposal to sweep aside the barrier which divided local from Imperial taxation. Then as to the remedy for the present state of things, for they were ready to propose one from that side, they could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman's wild declarations about free trade. He did not know, for instance, why he could not abate some of the incidence of taxation, say, upon chocolate and cocoa imported from the Colonies, which was heavily taxed. He did not know, moreover, why there should not be a reduction of the tea, coffee, or sugar duties upon goods coming from the same quarter. It was ludicrous that under our boasted free import system manufactured chocolate was protected and taxed on importation here 2s. 3d. to 8s. 6d. more than raw cocoa. He supposed the answer was that the Free Trade Party would not touch anything which savoured of colonial preference. He was sorry that that had not been done, but he felt certain that the time would come when the country would insist upon it, and it might be left to his Party to carry out what the Party opposite had completely declined to do, their idea of a remedy being to broaden the basis of taxation. The only breadth of this character, however, that appeared to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's sight was that the income-tax payer had a good broad basis to his back, upon which he intended to apply his rod. He thought the Opposition remedy was infinitely better, and that was tariff reform and colonial preference. Hon. Gentlemen seemed to forget that when the 1s. duty on corn was taken off nobody was ever heard to say that he was richer for it; on the contrary, he thought it would be an advantage, from the point of view of Empire, to have some duty of that kind. If the colonial corn was allowed to come in free it would be the foreign producer who would pay the 1s. or 2s. duty which might be imposed, because the foreigner must come down to the price of the colonial. If a scheme of that sort were adopted it would be much more efficacious than the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I rise now because unfortunately later on in the evening before the close of the debate I have another engagement elsewhere which I am obliged to fulfil, and as I do not wish to be regarded as disrespectful to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer I wish to notice the speech he made at the beginning of the debate. In one respect I set a very bad example to the Committee which has been universally followed by, I think, every speaker in the debate. I made a very long speech on Thursday last, and during the whole time I have been in the House to-day I have not heard a single short speech except that of my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education. I am going now to try to repair my bad example by compressing what I have to say into the fewest possible sentences. I rise really for the purpose only of removing misconceptions due, I am afraid, to want of clearness in some of the language that I myself used, though I did my utmost to make it clear; misconceptions which are prevalent outside, and which to some extent are reflected in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. For instance, I said in emphatic terms when introducing the Budget that we must face the fact that the income-tax had now become an integral part of our fiscal machinery. The right hon. Gentleman did not quarrel with that, but he translated it into something entirely different, namely, that I suggested, which I never did, that the income-tax was to be treated as a tax that was to remain permanent at, at least, 1s. if not something more. I defy any one to find a single sentence in my speech to justify that contention. At any rate that is not my view, and indeed it would be a most illegitimate use of political prophecy on my part to attempt to forecast what five, ten, or fifteen years hence the fiscal system of this country might be. I am budgeting, as I said on Thursday last, for the next two or three years, and it is in reference to that situation and that situation alone that what I said then and what I say now applies. Another question was put to me founded on an entirely different apprehension by my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean. I said I thought that if we were going in for a policy of social reform, which costs money, all classes of the community must contribute their share of the expense. That I think, is self evident, and I am certain there is not a representative of the working classes in this House who will not admit it to its fullest extent. I said further, in regard to two principal indirect taxes upon necessaries of life, namely, the sugar duty and the tea duty, that I did not feel I could make any remission in them consistently with the general object I presented to the House. That object is two-fold. In the first instance, we have imposed on us the duty, both by the exigencies of the country and by our own declarations and pledges, to make a manful, courageous, and exceptional effort to repair the public credit. I put that in the forefront at this moment as the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman has only to remember that in consequence of the South African War we have an addition to the National Debt of £130,000,000 to see that any Chancellor of the Exchequer who duly appreciates the gravity of the national situation is bound to make a solemn appeal to the House of Commons to forego remission of taxation in order to help him to relieve and mitigate this tremendous burden of debt. That is my first object. What is my second? My second is to provide the nucleus of a fund for social reforms, and in particular for making a start with that which I believe everyone, on both sides of the House, agrees is the most urgent instalment of social reform. I cannot fulfil those objects unless I ask the country and the House, as I do ask them, to make some sacrifice by foregoing remission of taxation this year. Of course, I know that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would tell me, in fact, I rather anticipated it in my speech, that I was a purblind and fanatical devotee of an obsolete system of fiscal philosophy, and that I had only to raise my vision to a wider horizon to see that there were large tracts of untaxed territory which were only awaiting the attention of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. I used an expression that seems to have given some pain to the right hon. Gentleman when I said that we were limited in our area of taxation. The right hon. Gentleman said that there was other ground, but I confess I prefer ground which is sound to ground which is boggy. The right hon. Gentleman differs from that, and complained that I should have been so disrespectful to a system of fiscal policy which prevailed in many continental countries and in a large number of our Colonies. But we are not missionaries or professors to lecture other countries on what they ought to do. The question is what should be done here in the United Kingdom. It is not necessary for the purposes of the free trade argument—I suppose I have made more speeches on the subject than any man in the House during the three years the controversy lasted, and I cannot charge my memory with having laid down on any single occasion any abstract principle as to the necessary superiority of free trade in all countries at all times and under all circumstances—it is sufficient for our purpose to say that here in these islands we cannot live and cannot carry on our industries; cannot keep our command of the markets of the world, and cannot keep open this the largest market in the world for foreign and Colonial products; cannot maintain the position which lies at the root of the foundation of our prosperity, unless we adhere not only to the doctrine but to the practice of free trade. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has told me where I might find the resources to make it possible to remit part of the income-tax, reduce the sugar duty, and perhaps to repeal the tea duty. Where am I to find those resources? By adopting a system of what is called Colonial preference. That is to say by taxing food products—corn, meat, butter, and the rest, the necessary staple food of the great majority of our population—which come from foreign countries at a higher rate than those which come from our Colonial possessions. But you cannot do justice even on the broadest and roughest scale between the different parts of the Empire unless you supplement preference on food by preference on raw material. South Africa, for instance, does not send food, but wool and hides, the raw material of some of our greatest industries. What answer can you give to South Africa when she complains that you have given a preference to Canada and Australia and says that she also is entitled to some share in the benefit of the arrangement entered into in the interests of the Empire for the purpose of strengthening its bonds? I have never seen any answer to that argument, and no answer has ever been given to it from that bench or anywhere else. The essential difference between the sugar and tea duties, which I agree are grievous taxes which weigh heavily on the class of our population least able to bear the burden, and those other taxes which it is proposed to substitute for them, is that they have this merit, that substantially the whole of the added price which the consumer pays, owing to the tax, goes into the Exchequer, whereas under the old system of the protective duties a large part of the added price which the consumer pays would be intercepted by the favoured interests. That is the reason why we stick to what the right hon. Gentleman regards as an antiquated system. The right hon. Gentleman complains of the inquisitorial developments in the income-tax which were outlined in my Budget speech. I have no paternal pride in the matter at all. This inquisitorial arrangement, which I am accused of having invented, is substantially founded on the suggestions of the able Departmental Committee appointed by the right hon. Gentleman himself, which sat for two years, and which was presided over by that clear-headed and excellent man of business, Lord Ritchie, whose loss we all deplore. It is a strange perversion of some observation I suppose I happened to drop, to say that I propose the abolition of the three years average in arriving at the amount to be paid by the income-tax payer. I have suggested nothing of the kind; it would be a monstrous thing to do. What I am going to ask the House to sanction—and it will be very beneficial to the revenue and do no harm to anybody if it is carried out—is to repeal Section 133 of the Act of 1842, which enables a man, if in his year of assessment his income falls below the amount of the three years average, to make application to have part of the amount paid refunded. This involves a loss to the revenue, and there is really no loss to the taxpayer if his year of assessment is unfruitful, for that year will, of course, come into the calculation for the next three years, and there is no reason whatever for going through the complicated system of refunding That is the arrangement we propose, following, not exactly the recommendation, but the spirit of the recommendation, of the Committee. I have been censured for having an open mind. I do not know why. I remember a Government that lived on an open mind. The late Prime Minister reproaches me with not having an open mind; the late Chancellor of the Exchequer because I have an open mind.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I did not reproach the right hon. Gentleman for having an open mind; he gave me to understand that he had no mind on the subject at all, though he subsequently corrected that impression. I was criticising the attitude I understood him to have adopted, that he had not made up his mind, and had not formed any opinion on the subject, until he then spoke.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not in the least object to the interruption. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that the arguments are nicely balanced upon this question of pension. It may be treated as deferred pay, and, it may be argued, is therefore entitled to the lower rate; or it may be treated as accumulated savings—accumulated, no doubt, by compulsion, the recipient not being a free agent, accumulated on his behalf by somebody else—and when he comes to the enjoyment of this, at his time of retiring, it may be argued that it should be treated as property and taxed on the higher scale. There is a great deal to be said on either side, and therefore I think I am not acting disrespectfully towards the Committee when I say that before I fully make up my mind I shall be glad to hear what is to be said on either side. My sole object is to avoid imposing a grievance, and at the same time I do not want to admit a principle of exemption which may be capable of indefinite and illegitimate extension in other directions. The right hon. Gentleman has put several concrete cases, most of which, not all, have been dealt with by the President of the Board of Education; but there was one point in reference to which he sought to score against me. He said I had departed from the terms "precarious" and "permanent" incomes which I had formerly used, and that now I propose to take as the real test or criterion of incomes—entitled to the lower or subject to the higher scale —whether they are "earned" or "unearned." Well, I frankly admit I am indebted to the Committee for their remarks on the subject, and I am convinced that the latter is the more logical arrangement for differentiating between the two classes. It is better understood, in popular parlance, as explaining what we want to have, namely, that the income taxed at a lower rate shall be that which is earned by personal labour or exertion. The other night I illustrated my argument by reference to the hardships that arise under the existing system, which taxes both earned and unearned income at the same rate. I pointed out how hardly this bore upon the man who makes provision for his old age. I was not contending, and I do not think I was understood as contending, for more than that the lumping the earned and unearned incomes in one category was doing an obvious and undesirable injustice. No doubt there will be many cases brought forward; the right hon. Gentleman is not the only recipient of letters on the subject. It is a very odd thing—and I cannot but refer to it—that you never in these cases get a single expression of gratitude in these letters from any of the people of the class whom by your legislation or your change in taxation it is intended to benefit. On the contrary, the moment you make a proposal, which it is not denied will be an immense boon to a large number of people, you are overwhelmed with letters containing objurgations and indignant remonstrances from people who have been paying the shilling all their taxpaying lives, and who did not know they had a grievance until, finding themselves near the border line of differentiation, they cry out to be allowed to come over to enjoy the relief. That is the character of the correspondence. I say frankly you can find nothing approaching mathematical or, as old philosophers would call it, strict distributive justice in this class of case; the perplexities and complications of human nature and society and industry are so great that no wit of man has ever yet conceived a perfectly logical system. All we can do is to try something that will be a nearer approximation to justice than the present system. I have studied the subject, and shall continue to study the subject, with as much sympathy as I can command—and there have been large drafts upon my reserve of sympathy; I shall study all such cases in the hope that, if they can be brought within the equity of the change, they may in some form be brought within the exemption. What used to perturb Mr. Gladstone, as will be seen by reference to his statement on the Budget of 1852—I think it was—and as will be seen from the passage of the Report which has been read of the Committee of 1861—a rather colourless Report, drawn up, apparently, by Sir Stafford Northcote —what used to perturb Mr. Gladstone was the picture of the poor widow with £150 or £300 a year, left by her husband, with which she had to bring up her children and give them a start in life. Mr. Gladstone could not help contrasting this picture with that of a bustling young and energetic professional man who, though really making the same income, could look forward to a considerable improvement of his position in the future. This was the case Mr. Gladstone constantly quoted, and it was a case which impressed the House of Commons. But let the Committee remember that extensions of our illogical and haphazard system of exemptions and abatements have enormously reduced hardships of this character. The poor widow whose income is £300 does not pay 1s. income-tax; she has an abatement of £160, and only pays on £140, and the rate in fact comes to 5½d. in the pound. The additional relief in a case like that, with this measure of differentation, would be almost infinitesimal. In point of fact you get rid of almost all—I will not say all—but by far the most serious cases of hardship by the exemptions rising as high as £700, and, on the other hand, by keeping the limit at £2,000. Confining ourselves within these limits we get rid of the most oppressive burdens existing, and, without predicting or prejudging what hereafter may be the figure of the tax should it become a permanent part of our fiscal system, I ask the Committee to accept the proposal put before them as one which, on the whole, is a long-delayed and much-needed measure of practical justice to the taxpayers of the country.

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that with regard to the question of differentiation, neither the Chancellor of the Exchequer nor the President of the Board of Education had given the Committee any information whatever as to the bearing of the incidence of the death duties upon it. Anyone who had read the Report of the Select Committee must have been impressed by the evidence given by Sir Henry Primrose, who pointed out that, although the income-tax did not of itself provide for differentiation, yet differentiation was provided for indirectly by the stamp duties, the house duty, and the death duties. Some very interesting tables were laid before the Committee showing exactly what effect the death duties had in regard to differentiation. He would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the figures given in those tables. Sir Henry Primrose produced a table which proved that the estate duties really amounted to a very heavy burden on the inheritor of an estate; and his figures showed that a person who succeeded to an estate worth from £1,000 to £10,000 bringing in an income of £40 to £400, really paid a charge on his annual income of 9d. in the pound. In the case of estates worth £10,000 to £25,000 that charge amounted to 1s. in the pound; £25,000 to £50,000, 1s. 1½d.; and £50,000 to £75,000, 1s. 3d. Those were very striking figures, and they ought to be seriously taken into consideration. He thought some reason ought to be given by the Government for not following the advice of the Commissioners of the Board of Inland Revenues, who were in favour of adhering the system of differentiation afforded by the death duties instead of adopting the present proposal. Mr. Bernard Mallet also showed by another table that a person who inherited an estate bringing in £200 a year paid 2·60 of his whole income in annual charges, whereas a person earning a similar income only paid 1 per cent. of his income. In other words a person who inherited an estate bringing in £200 a year paid 2·60 times as much as the person who was earning £200 a year. A person inheriting an estate worth £500 a year paid 5·64 of his whole income whereas the possessor of an earned income of £500 a year paid 3·50. An income from an estate of £700 paid 6·64 and an earned income of £700 4·50, and so on up to £2,000, when the unearned income paid 7·40 and an earned income of that amount 5 per cent. Those calculations were based on the estate duties only, and did not include charges under the legacy succession and settlement estate duties; and if those were taken together the proportion would be very much higher. Those were very important points, and he submitted to the Committee that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had determined to carry out a system of differentiation it would have been much more simple to have readjusted the scale of these various duties. What he suggested would have saved an infinite amount of trouble and expense, and would have avoided a very great feeling of injustice which would undoubtedly be experienced by those who came just outside the limit. This differentiation would compel a person to pay upon his savings and he would be penalised, whereas if the death duties were adopted to carry out the principle of differentiation the person who would have to pay the penalty would not be the man who earned the savings, but the person who inherited them. He was under the impression that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean had stated that the Committee which considered the question of the graduation of the income-tax were in favour of this differentiation. He did not think that was correct, because what the Committee reported was that the system was practicable; but they did not report that it was desirable; and nobody who read the evidence put forward by the officials of the Board of Inland Revenue could come to any other conclusion. Sir Henry Primrose, when asked whether he was in favour of the new system of differentiation said that he was not, and that if anything was done in that direction it should be done by means of the death duties. As regarded earned and unearned incomes, he agreed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had adopted the best terms. The terms suggested were permanent and precarious incomes or incomes derived from investments or personal exertions. It was obvious that many incomes derived from investments were anything but permanent, and incomes derived from personal exertions were often very precarious; and those distinctions would have led to very great difficulties. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division had clearly pointed out that there would be considerable difficulty in the case of small traders to find out what part of their income was derived from personal exertions, and what part was the result of the investment of their capital. He was strongly in favour of the differentiation not being put higher than £2,000. With regard to the case of an owner managing his own estate, he did not think that point had received a fair answer. The President of the Board of Education had said that nothing new had happened in such a case, because the landlord was assessed under Schedule A and the farmer was assessed in his profits under Schedule B. That was quite true, but it did not touch the question of how much time a man managing his own estate spent upon it. At the present moment the landlord paid far more in excess of his share of taxation than any other income-taxpayer; because anyone who knew anything of the management of an estate was aware that the allowance made in respect of upkeep was totally inadequate. A landlord was always assessed on the gross rental of his farms, upon which he was allowed a reduction of ⅛ upon land and ⅙ on buildings. He submitted that those two abatements were not by any means a fair proportion of what the owner actually spent upon the upkeep of his estate. If a landlord managing his own estate was not to be treated as earning his income the least they could do was to give the landlord a fair abatement in respect of the upkeep of his estate and of the time he spent upon its managment. The question of the effect these stages would have upon the actual revenue was a very important one. It was impossible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to estimate correctly what the actual difference would be. One thing was, however, undoubtedly true, and that was that there would be very many hard cases and much injustice would be felt by those people who came just outside the limit. He instanced the case for example of two men earning by their own personal exertions £1,900 a year each. One of them had accumulated no savings, but the other by careful expenditure and economical management had managed to save a sum which brought him in £200 a year from investments. That income from his savings would bring him over the limit and he would not be able to claim any abatement on the earning clause, while his friend who had not saved anything would be able to claim an abatement. That was a great hardship which would certainly lead to discontent. He was afraid under these proposals people would be tempted not to furnish proper returns of their income, or else they would be tempted to divide up portions of their income and invest them in separate funds amongst their children. In that case people might keep themselves below the limit and claim abatements. All these things would have a very considerable effect on the revenue of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LONDON PORT AND DOCKS BILL [BY ORDER].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) moved that the Bill be read upon this day six months. He said he did not propose to go at any length over the contents of the Bill, although he thought it contained propositions which would be very legitimate matter of debate upon the Second Reading. It appeared to him that the proposed dues on goods should be collected at the Customs House by the public authority. The proposal to divide between the dock companies and the river authority the proceeds of the port dues was in his opinion open to objection because the dock companies were profit-making concerns, and it was a very grave question whether such a proposition should receive the sanction of the House. He desired to discuss the measure not so much upon what it contained as upon the larger consideration of what he regarded as the interests of the Port of London. It appeared to him that at the present time there was every reason why, in the interests of the port, they should pause before they did anything further of a piecemeal character. The considerations which governed the interests of the port required a comprehensive measure once and for all dealing with the whole subject. The Port of London was altogether unique. It stood apart from nearly every other port in the country. He did not desire to take up the time of the House by going over the different propositions which had brought them to the position they occupied that night. There was no doubt that the present stagnation had arisen through the jealousy of the varying interests involved. It was not necessary for him to point out the great differences between the Port of London and the other ports of the United Kingdom. Everybody knew that Manchester had the ship canal. They knew what had been done in connection with the Mersey by the Dock and Harbour Board, and they were familiar also with the efforts which had been made in connection with the Tyne and the Clyde. He did not propose to discuss the details of these different ports. The dominating question which existed in connection with all of them was how the necessary money was to be got in order to carry out the work, and what ought to be the controlling body which should carry out the administrative work. There were different proposals continually placed before the House in connection with this subject. They heard a great deal about Antwerp and the Thames Conservancy, to which he happened to belong. He had made two or three expeditions to Antwerp and other important Continental ports to investigate what had been done there, and to get the advantage of knowledge of what was going on. But the Port of Antwerp could not be properly compared to that of London on business grounds, for these reasons. Antwerp was aided enormously by what he would term national funds. The Port of London, after all, had been conducted on purely business lines. When he looked at the figures as to how these different ports had progressed he said at once that the comparison in his opinion was altogether fallacious. If he read the figures showing what London had really done it would appear that the result was not so bad. In fact, the Port of London would bear a good deal of looking into. In 1895 the Port of London tonnage of shipping inwards with cargo amounted to 14,200,000, while for the last year in respect of which figures were available the tonnage was 17,450,000. Liverpool had risen from 7,800,000 to 9,800,000. He mentioned these figures simply by way of illustration in order to show that London had increased by a larger tonnage than any other port, and that at the present moment it stood in the proud position of being more than equal to Antwerp and Rotterdam put together, their combined total being only 14,000,000. This question was a difficult one, and he believed that the main trouble had arisen in connection with what was to be done in regard to the taking over of the docks and wharves. He did not know what might be the feeling in the House, but they were all familiar with the findings of the Royal Commission. They recollected that if the original idea of taking over the water companies had been earlier accepted on the recommendations of Mr. Cross's Committee, or even that of Sir William Vernon Harcourt, it would have been a great deal better for London. They knew, equally in connection with licenses, that if Mr. Bruce's proposals had been accepted at the time they were made, it would have been better for all of them. He ventured to think that in this country it was generally recognised that a private interest was not to be ruthlessly interfered with. He was not going to lay down what principle ought to be followed respecting control, but he believed the time was coming when the Government should face the question of the Port of London and produce legislation which would, as far as possible, do no harm to the private individual but lay down the principle that the port should be controlled by a public authority, and that the present condition of affairs should be ended—that the Thames Conservancy, as it now existed, should cease to exist—and that there should be an authority governing the upper river, and be another authority controlling the Port of London. From his experience as a member of the Thames Conservancy he was personally of opinion that that body had been unduly assailed by people who did not understand its working or its powers. According to the powers at their disposal and according to the weapons and tools they had to work with, he, with all respect, expressed the view that they had done the very best they possibly could do in the circumstances. Whenever they had made proposals they had been assailed by particular interests—persons who were looking after their own particular affairs. The Thames Conservancy proposed a Bill after the Report of the Royal Commission was published, and it adopted as far as possible the recommendations of the Commission. After a time it became evident that the whole Bill could not pass. The Thames Conservancy therefore threw over a great many of its propositions, but it left in one which carried with it the principle that the Thames Conservancy should be immediately entrusted with power to raise revenue for the purpose of extended dredging. What was the answer of the Thames Conservancy? That was passed unanimously through the House, and the Thames Conservancy, in carrying it into effect, had done what he believed would be of great future advantage to the Port of London. He thought that the policy of the Thames Conservancy could not be fairly attacked. They had made no serious mistake, but they simply had not the means to carry out the work which it was necessary for them to undertake. He would not attempt to discuss what ought to be the constitution of the Port of London, but personally he could not help feeling this. He recognised that the London County Council proposal to have a controlling interest was a perfectly legitimate one if they were to be responsible for the financial security to carry on the new authority. In that case they were undoubtedly entitled to a controlling influence. He himself favoured the lines of the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board, the Tyne Commissioners, and the Clyde Trustees, as much more desirable in the interest of all concerned. Briefly put, it amounted to this, that those who provided the money—the shipowners, due-payers, or whoever they might be—were the people who were best qualified to see that the money was properly spent. If they required business facilities they would not hesitate to tax themselves in order to raise revenue to improve the port, for the purpose of assisting in the development of their business. As to economical expenditure, if it really was their money that was going out they would be very careful to see that it was wisely and properly spent. They knew that in connection with Liverpool and the two northern ports that system had worked very well indeed, and he thought that it would be so also in London. Last year when a similiar Motion was proposed by the hon. Member for St. Pancras, he suggested that it was desirable that there should be a conference of the parties principally concerned. The President of the Board of Trade agreed to that idea, and a conference was held, the discussions at which cleared the air. It did not accomplish all they wished, but some points of difference were compassed and he thought the decisions arrived at would make it easier for the Government Department to draft the measure which they proposed to bring forward. A great deal had been heard about the Port of Antwerp. That port received assistance out of the public funds of the Belgian Government. The British Government had made themselves responsible as guarantors for Irish land, and he thought it would not be unreasonable if, in some form or another, on business lines they took upon themselves responsibility in connection with the development of the Port of London. He did not believe they would be ever called upon to fulfil any guarantee. The port could easily be made self-supporting. It was for this reason, among others, that he ventured to move the postponement of the Bill, for he was hopeful that the President of the Board of Trade would announce his intention of bringing in a measure, which, once and for all, might settle this very great and vital question.

*MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said that the Second Reading of the Dock Company's Bill afforded a very welcome opportunity for discussing the urgent needs of the Port of London. That was perhaps the best that could be said about it. The recent disclosures concerning the contribution made by the Dock Company to political propaganda would hardly have inclined the ear of the House of Commons towards them, even if the Bill itself, in view of the history of the movement for the reform of the Port of London, had not been altogether an impossible proposition. What were the proposals put forward by the Dock Companies, and what relation did they bear to the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and to the Bill of the late Government? First of all, it was proposed to impose upon all goods imported from over seas (except transhipment goods) dues on a scale copied from that in force in the Port of Liverpool. The Dock Company and the Conservancy were to share in the proceeds of these dues in proportion to the amount of goods discharged in the river and docks respectively. The exact amount of the yield was not certain, but in all it should not be less than £750,000 per annum, and of this it was estimated that two-thirds would go to the Dock Company. It was notable that in addressing his shareholders in 1902, Mr. Cater Scott, the Chairman of the London and India Docks Company said, that "A proper system of charges need not be as high as the Liverpool Schedule." It had also to be remembered that the dock rates and charges were in most cases higher in London than in Liverpool, so that to add to the dues actually levied in Liverpool would be detrimental to the interests of those using the Port. Further, the Government Bill in 1903 did not impose dues, but only gave the Commission the option of imposing them, and it was clear from the proceedings on that Bill that it was not necessarily intended that the option should be exercised. It was, of course, impossible to exaggerate the importance of not making London a dear port. The evidence given before the Commission by the London Waterside Manufacturers Committee stated that the members of that committee imported annually 8,000,000 tons of raw material. Thus it was easy to understand what enabled

London to be a great manufacturing centre, and the raw material so imported was actually able to compete in the manufactured form with foreign goods which came in at the same port. The second desire of the company was to put a tax on barges, amounting to 3s. 6d. on those under 100 tons, and 5s. on those over. It was hoped that the yield of that tax would amount to £30,000 a year. The Royal Commission considered the proposal to curtail the ancient right known as "free water," and described it as an attempt by the company to secure "power to tax their rivals in trade in order to recover a lost position." He would come in a moment to the important part played by the wharves in the success of the port, and it was only necessary now to say that any proposal to limit their present privileges would have to be considered with the greatest care. The third proposal of the company was to reduce the shipping dues from 1s. 6d. to 1s. It would be remembered that some five years ago these dues were raised from 1s. to the statutory maximum of 1s. 6d. In view of the profits which the company would derive were their other proposals accepted, it was not surprising that they were willing to bait their line with this sprat. He now came to what the company proposed to do in return for the privileges conferred. They offered to spend £2,000,000 on dock extensions. That sounded a large figure, but it was worth remembering that Mr. Cater Scott in his evidence spoke of two or three millions which would be "necessary for meeting all the dock requirements of the port on very moderate terms." Further, the Royal Commission recommended an expenditure of £4,500,000 on dock extensions and improvements. What the proposals amounted to, therefore, was that the company proposed to spend less than half what the Royal Commission recommended, and yet desired to impose a scale of dues on goods which was certainly much heavier than the Commission ever contemplated. The next proposal was that the Thames Conservancy should spend £1,000,000 on improving the river. Whether that proposal was made with the consent and approbation of the Conservators was not stated, but under the new scheme of dues it was estimated that they would receive about £237,500. The Royal Commission suggested that a sum of £2,500,000 should be spent on dredging, and proposed, as it would be remembered, that the London County Council should find the money. Then there was the power which it was proposed to give the Board of Trade to increase the number of Conservators from thirty-eight to forty-five. What was the reason for that? The Bill sought to give the dock companies public money. It proposed what was in effect a tax on all the trade of London, and as they had a Government pledged to public control following public money, the promoters felt constrained to make an offer which should have at least the appearance of a concession to the public. It took the facetious form of "public money for the docks, public control for the Conservancy." Was it necessary to add that no such tinkering could possibly make the Thames Conservancy a suitable port authority? To sum up the objections, no private Bill could possibly deal with a problem of this magnitude. That was the reason given by the Conservative Government for rejecting the London County Council Bill in 1905. Further, the present proposals were quite inadequate to meet the needs of the port. The Commission recommended an expenditure of four and a half millions on the docks, and two and a half millions on the river. Again, it was of paramount importance to keep London a cheap port. The Commission only countenanced the imposition of dues as a last resort. Finally the object of the Bill was to set up the finances of the dock companies, and in consequence it would increase the purchase price should it ever become necessary for a port authority to take them over. The fact that the company's proposal was a bad one did not diminish the urgency of the problem. There was absolute unanimity as to the necessity for a new port authority. The mere enumeration of the existing bodies and their powers and constitution proved the need for a unified control. On the need for a new authority the Conservators, the London Chamber of Commerce, and Lord Desborough's Committee were all in agreement. Leaving the question of the constitution of such an authority, he came to the powers which should be bestowed upon it, and the important question of taking over the docks. Supposing the new authority purchased the whole undertaking—docks, warehouses, and all as a going concern. They then would find themselves in this dilemma. If they kept the warehouses, they would be in active competitions with the wharfingers. If, however, as was half-heartedly recommended by the Royal Commission, they disposed of the warehouses, they would then have parted with the most profitable part of the undertaking, and at a price which must entail a loss, because clearly the warehouses as an independent undertaking would not be so valuable as when running in connection with the docks. That certainly did not point to the advisability of the purchase of the docks. There was another matter worth consideration from the business point of view. Was it wise to put public money into dock undertakings? Let the case of the wharves be considered. These wharves dealt with an enormous and increasing amount of the trade of the port. The Royal Commission said that—

> "The business of wharves, independent of the docks, has, under the present arrangements, grown to a magnitude unequalled in any other port,"

and the Thames Conservancy in support of their Bill in 1905 said—

> "More than one-half of the tonnage of the port is dealt with at wharves and moorings in the river, and in respect of that part of its trade London is the cheapest port in Europe, so far as the dues payable to the port authority are concerned."

Taking the figures of 1901 and 1905, it was found that in that period, while the total tonnage dealt with in the docks had increased by only 207,953, the total tonnage dealt with in the port had increased by 1,236,494. It had to be remembered, too, that at Hamburg, Rotterdam, and Antwerp large use was made of river quays. Sir Thomas Sutherland and Mr. Beckett Hill advocated this development before the Royal Commission, and it was stated that at one time the Peninsular and Oriental Company had actually purchased land with a view to constructing such a quay. It was a striking fact that in Antwerp, notwithstanding the recent addition to dock accommodation, more than half the tonnage was dealt with at river quays, and, further, the average tonnage of the ships was greater at the quays than at the docks. It was true that at the moment all the development was taking the shape of docks, but when the question of the diversion of the river bed was settled, no doubt the construction of more river quays would be proceeded with. Finally, he might point out that quite recently the Board of Trade had sanctioned an undertaking for the construction of river quays at Long Reach. Those considerations made it necessary to think carefully before recommending the purchase of the docks by the new authority. This was not a question, however, the decision of which need stand in the way of the setting up of the new port authority which they all desired to see. There were many duties quite unconnected with the management of docks and warehouses. There was the deepening of the river which the Commission estimated to cost £2,500,000. Surely it was not too much to ask that the Goverment should find that money. London handled 31 per cent. of the import trade of the country, and the service might well be regarded as a national one. The new authority might also take over the maintenance, management, and control of dock entrances and waterways. These, of course, were only suggestions, but with a strong Commission consisting of worthy representatives of the greatest port in the world it ought not to be impossible to do something to save London from the decline that was feared for it. It was true that so far they had held their own, but in matters of this kind it was absolutely necessary to be ahead of the times. He maintained that it should be the duty of a new authority to maintain the port up to the requirements of her trade, and he hoped they would hear from the President of the Board of Trade that it was the intention of the Government to deal with this matter with the boldness and completeness which its importance demanded.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Barnard.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Sir E. BOYLE (Taunton) thought the last speaker was altogether mistaken in his view that the port dues of London were higher than those of other ports. The hon. Member had also said that £2,000,000 for the construction of a new dock was inadequate, but after careful consideration the promoters believed that it was every penny that would be required. In addition, the hon. Member had talked about a tax being levied under the Bill upon goods coming into London, but, of course, if one had to support docks, the money must be got from somewhere and the promoters thought it was fair that it should come from the goods which passed through the docks. The £7,000,000 estimate provided for much more than the construction of a dock; it also included the cost of widening and deepening the river and several other charges. The objects of the Bill were of such a character that he thought they would, to the mind of any unbiassed Member, bring more or less conviction as to its utility. There was nothing in the Bill that could be considered of an objectionable character. He was not going to read any of the clauses of the measure, because they were very lengthy, but he would summarise the more important ones as they stood as amended after interviews with the chief interests concerned. The Bill constituted the Thames Conservancy as the port authority, with duties to dredge the river, to regulate traffic on the river, and to collect port dues on ships and the new dues on goods. It gave the Board of Trade power to compel the dock companies to make any further and necessary improvements required by traders, and it left the dock companies as they were. But it put an obligation on the London and India Docks Company to construct at once a new dock and other works to cost £2,000,000, and on the other two companies and the London and India Docks Company to do whatever was necessary from time to time. It reduced the dues on ships from 1s. 6d. to 1s. per ton as recommended by the Royal Commission. Moreover it put dues on goods limited in amount by a schedule attached to the Bill. That again was the unanimous recommendation of the Royal Commission and was done at every other port except Hull. Coastwise transhipment and export goods were to be exempted. The schedule attached to the Bill, whether it was high or low, was the Liverpool schedule, and the Bill gave to traders an appeal to the Board of Trade and the Railway Commissioners on every port and dock charge, so getting over any question of the dues on goods being said to kill any manufactures or any trade by putting an exceptional charge upon them. These were the chief objects as set out in the Bill, and he was sure that there was no unbiassed and open-minded member of the commercial world who, after going through the measure, would find anything greatly to object to in it. It was true that it gave the London and India Docks Company power to levy dues on goods up to the amount of an annual payment rising to £270,000 in 1911 and thereafter. Why did it do that? It did it for the reason that the dock company undertook to spend £2,000,000, the amount which on the highest authority was said to be necessary, on a new dock; that sum would not be raised under 4 per cent., which equalled £80,000 a year. The dock must be a burden for many years until it came into full use; it could not be remunerative for twenty years at least, as a dock must be built far larger than present requirements, to meet future needs. Another reason was that the dock company were giving up 6d. per ton on dues on ships, and therefore that amount had to be got from somewhere. That 6d. per ton would amount to £150,000. In addition the dock company would have to pay increased rates and taxes and other outgoings on the new docks, and that would amount to £40,000 a year making a total of £270,000. This £270,000 which the Bill provided for would be gradually reduced as the new dock came into play, and in view of these figures it was a mistake for anyone to say that the Bill enriched the company. It did no such thing, but the port would get a new dock and the public further and better accommodation. The dock companies had no objection to being taken over by a board of trustees, they had no objection to being taken over by the London County Council or any other authority. All they said was that what had to be done in this direction should be done at once as time was of the greatest consequence. The effect of the adjournment of the question even for one year was to be deplored. If, at the end of that period, some method of purchase was provided for by the Board of Trade by means of a Port Trust, it would be two years before the proposal could be carried out. He took the precedent of the water companies, and said two years, because that period elapsed before they, after the passing of the measure, finally took over the undertakings of the water companies. With the year's delay, that made three years before anything could be done, and then it would take at least a year for the new authority to ascertain where was the best place to construct the new docks and to get out plans and specifications and make contracts for the building. If the Bill was not passed, therefore, it was practically impossible to relieve the pressure on the space of the docks till the year 1911. It must take four years. Supposing however, the dock companies were allowed to proceed with this Bill, they could start to get out their plans, specifications, and contracts next August, and there was no reason why the dock should not be open to receive ships in 1911. There was another reason why they should be allowed to proceed with the measure this session. The dock would be constructed in the poorest part of London, in the East End, and if they were allowed to commence it this year, the necessary work would give relief to thousands of working men in the district. The construction would last over this Christmas, next Christmas, and the Christmas after, and directly the work was completed the dock would give employment to thousands of people in the district in which it was most required. If the Bill passed it would do nothing whatever to stop a Port Trust or any other arrangement when the Government thought fit to bring it forward, with this advantage to the Government, that at any rate the maximum claim would be to some extent fixed, as the Bill would limit the dock companies to a dividend of 4 per cent. The dock companies had brought in a special sterilisation clause to that effect to meet the objection that their dividend would be unrestricted. He would not read the clause because it was a little long, but it was to the effect that they were willing to limit the return on the new capital, spent on the construction of the dock, to 4 per cent. for the next four years so as to give the Government time to take over the Dock undertaking. There did not seem to him to be anything very grasping in that proposal. They were willing, so as not to stop the necessities of the port being adapted to the requirements of the trade, to say, "Let us commence this dock; let us charge interest at 4 per cent. and you at any moment may step in and only pay us the cost of constructing the dock plus 4 per cent. on the money we have spent." He thought it must be admitted that the matter was urgent. In 1903, in the King's Speech, the necessity of dealing with the Port of London was referred to as a matter of "urgent national concern." They were now in 1907, and such was the urgency of the matter that the dock companies would be content to accept only this return of the money actually expended upon the new dock.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Four per cent. on what?

*SIR E. BOYLE replied that it was 4 per cent. interest on the capital employed in constructing the new dock. He did not wonder at it striking the right hon. Gentleman as moderate. It was not 4 per cent. on the capital of the company, but 4 per cent. on the cost of the dock.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked where that was in the Bill. It did not appear from anything he was officially told in the Bill, which was what he was talking about. The only thing which he had officially was the document which he held in his hand, and the hon. and learned Gentleman had no right to refer to extraneous matters.

*SIR E. BOYLE said that, if the right hon. Gentleman would refer to the new clause which was to be added to the Bill, he would see that it set out what he had stated in no uncertain terms.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) inquired in what part of the Bill it was to be inserted.

*SIR E. BOYLE said he did not know as he had not the Bill with him, but the new clause ran—

"If the undertaking of the company is purchased at any rate not later than four years from the passing of this Act, otherwise than by agreement, by any public body or trustees, the provisions of this Act shall not be taken into account in ascertaining the price or consideration to be paid by such body or trustees for the said undertaking. Provided that in the event of such purchase the company may bring into account the actual amount of any capital expenditure made by them in pursuance of the obligations imposed on them by or under this Act together with interest at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum from the date of such expenditure."

Last year the Company brought in a Bill which would have assisted both themselves and the Millwall Docks, but they had to withdraw it because of the sterilisation clause that was insisted upon by the President of the Board of Trade, who said he would bring in a Bill this year. He knew how a sterilisation clause affected the claims of the Water Board, and he asked hon. Members who were business men whether they would submit to be put under a contract which meant "Heads I win and tails you lose." The returns of a dock company were not certain, but speculative. They depended on the trade. Let them imagine a dock company saying that if they earned 6 per cent. they would never accept more than 4 per cent., and if they earned nothing they would be content. If that sterilisation clause was put in it meant that the Bill would be thrown out. The present Bill had the support of the shipowners, merchants, and large timber trade of this country and other traders, but it was obvious that in a Bill of this magnitude it was impossible to please everybody. Somebody was bound to object. All he asked was that the Bill should be allowed to go forward, and that if it was just and beneficial it should be passed into law. If it was unjust let it be thrown out, but let the House not destroy it unheard with the sterilisation clause. If the Bill was allowed to go upstairs, if there were any objections they would be investigated, and if there was no substance in them they would be put on one side. During the last seven years the Company had spent £20,000 in bringing in Bills to obtain what they believed would be beneficial to the country and themselves. That was the position seven years ago when they were first seized of the necessity for the enlarging of the Port of London, not only for their benefit but for the benefit of the traders at that port. Since that date 1,200,000 tons more had come to the Port of London, and so far as the Company were concerned, they had no more area or facilities to offer now than then. Was there any other reason that should impress itself on the Government why they should give to the Company the relief they asked? Hon. Members would be somewhat surprised to know that at the present moment these great docks, the greatest in the world in one sense, did not possess an opening wide enough to admit battleships of the "Dreadnought" type, and that the Thames Shipbuilding Company lost the contract to build such ships because there was no dock in which they could be docked in the Port of London. To put it into colloquial language, that was bad business; bad for the port not to be able to accommodate such ships and bad for the State that the Thames shipbuilders were not able to contract for that size of vessel, because if they were constructed on the Thames there was no place in which to dock them. With our clear improving trade this was a really pressing subject, and the Company did not want to be put off with fair sounding terms and kindly wishes. They wanted to have a firm, clear, and definite promise that something would be done which would prevent the trade of the Port of London being injured and that the docks of London should no longer be restricted from making the full use of the natural advantages and magnificent premises they possessed. In 1905, that tonnage of the Port of London was 285,000,000, in this last year it was 314,000,000—an increase of 29,000,000, and the docks had no more facilities, no more advantages, to offer the public than in former years, and if the ships were too big they had to refuse them altogether. Things had arrived at such a pass that something must now be done. They had waited patiently and had been buffetted every way by one Government and another who had seen the necessity but done nothing, and if they were not now allowed to press this matter further the right hon. Gentleman ought to give some definite pledge that he would without further delay relieve the Docks Company from the unfair position in which they had been placed and take such steps as might be desirable for the improvement and protection of the Port.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said the House would appreciate that the question before them was of great magnitude and complexity, and also of the greatest possible urgency. He agreed with those who said that they wanted practical performance and not merely fair words. As a member of the Royal Commission that investigated this question for two years, he regretted that the 1903 Bill had not been passed into law. In the course of the inquiry no fact astonished him more than the volume of the trade of London, which was by far the greatest port in the world. There was no signs of diminution of trade, but proof of a steady increase in its volume, even since the Report of the Royal Commission had been issued. He would like to read one of the concluding paragraphs of the Report of the Commission which put the matter very clearly—

> "In conclusion we desire to say that our enquiry into the conditions of the Port of London has convinced us of its splendid natural advantages Among these are the geographical position of the Port; the magnitude, wealth and energy of the population behind it; the fine approach from the sea; the river tides strong enough to transport traffic easily to all parts, yet not so violent as to make navigation difficult; land along the shores of a character suitable for dock construction and all commercial purposes. In addition to these advantages, London possesses docks, which, although they are not in some cases upon the level of modern requirements, are yet capacious and capable of further development. The deficiencies of London as a Port, to which our attention has been called, are not due to any physical circumstances, but to causes which may easily be removed by a better organisation of administrative and financial powers."

While sympathising with the objects sought to be attained by the Bill, he could not agree with its methods. Clauses 25 to 38 relating to the constitution of the Thames Conservancy, were surely almost *ultra vires*; actually out of order they could not be, the Bill having been put from the Chair. Coming to the works proposed, they were urgently needed; everybody wanted the work done who knew anything of the circumstances of the case. He rather regretted to hear what had fallen from the hon. Member for Taunton with regard to the sterilisation clause. The omission of the Thames Conservancy clauses and the adoption of a reasonable sterilisation clause would be to his mind the ideally best course. But he dared say that his right hon. friend on looking carefully over the case had found himself not quite able to take that course, especially after what had fallen from the hon. Member. Therefore, it came to this, that, though the Bill had considerable merits, he did not suppose for a single moment that, having regard to the Report of the Royal Commission, and to the universal demand there was that the Thames should be placed as regarded the administrative authority in the same position as that occupied by some of our great rivers—the Government saw their way to allowing the Bill to be read a second time. The President of the Board of Trade would speak for the Government of course, and he earnestly urged him not merely to make a promise or to say a few fair words, but to bind himself by a Parliamentary pledge to introduce a Bill dealing with the whole subject next year. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, who was the one other Member of the House on the Royal Commission, permitted him to speak on his behalf. The rignt hon. Gentleman wrote to him as follows:—

> "I think the delay in putting through the improvements of the port which we recommended is deplorable. In my opinion the docks ought not to be impeded in legislation, appropriate to their powers and constitution, except on a distinct pledge by the Government themselves to pass a Bill next year."

It was purely a non-political and business matter. Following the precedent of 1903, the Bill could go to a Joint Committee, and it would come back from that Committee in such a position that the Government would be able to put it through. He did most earnestly hope that they would have a Parliamentary pledge from his right hon. friend of the nature he had indicated.

*Mr. WILES (Islington, S.) said he desired to support the rejection of the Bill for two reasons. First of all, because the Bill seemed to him one of the most astounding proposals that had ever been put before Parliament; and, in the second place, because he felt that the dock companies of London, in the days that they had been handling the trade of the port, had failed in their trust to the people and commerce of London. The Bill was opposed by all the organised trades of London. Shippers, sugar merchants, metal merchants, those engaged in the grain and flour trade, and those connected with the whole of the riverside warehouses, were all opposed to the Bill and with no uncertain voice. He believed it was understood that the Bill was promoted by all the dock companies of London, but really he thought that it was promoted by the London and India Dock Joint Committee. He believed that that Committee managed the Albert and Victoria Dock, the West India Dock and the Tilbury Dock Companies had some working agreement with the Millwall Dock Company, and the Commercial Dock Company he thought only gave a half-hearted support to the measure. The latter was the only dock, he believed, which had been managed in an efficient and business-like manner, and the only dock company which paid a dividend and had given satisfaction to the traders of London. The proposal of the Bill was to put a tax on all goods which came into London from over the sea. Further, it proposed to put a tax upon barges that were obliged to enter the docks to take goods off steamers. As far as he could see very little advantage was going to be given to the merchants and traders of London in exchange for the tax to be put upon goods. The only advantage suggested was that a new dock was to be built at a cost of something like two millions of money. He thought that it was a great question whether the new dock was required in London. What Londoners and merchants and shippers required was that the present dock accommodation should be brought to a perfect condition by the introduction of modern machinery; that, he believed, would give satisfaction. If the Bill passed, a tax would be put on the raw material of all the manufactures and industries of the River Thames, simply, he believed, to enable the dock companies to make better dividends, and perhaps very few, if any, facilities would be given for delivery and despatch in the management of the docks. He spoke with rather bitter experience of the dock companies. He had been in business in the City for twenty-five years, and he knew that everyone who had brought a large amount of goods through the docks had always found that London was in a worse position than the other great ports of the country. Especially was the trade of London hampered by the management, or he might say, very often the mismanagement of the docks of the Joint Committee. The grain trade, with which he was acquainted, was perhaps the largest trade that passed through the docks of London, and it was the one which had suffered particularly. A few years ago London not only supplied the great district of the Home Counties, but she also a large through trade with the Midlands. London had lost that trade very largely, because buyers said that the delay was so great when they bought in London, the weights so irregular, and they never knew what charges would be made by the dock companies. They said that they would rather buy from Liverpool, Hull, or Bristol, because those ports took pride in the management of their docks, and the docks at none of those ports were managed by private enterprise. The London dock companies had long realised the tremendous consumption of the growing districts of the Home Counties and of the districts around London, and they thought, he supposed, that they had a monopoly of that tremendous trade. But in the last few years the ports of Harwich and Southampton had grown up like mushrooms, and they had made great competition with the traders of London. In those two ports, especially in Harwich, the working-out charges were very light indeed. In London it cost 1s. 9d. to work grain from a steamer into lighters; in Harwich they could work it for 10d. or 1s. a ton, leaving a profit to the contractors. When representations were made to the London dock companies about these disadvantages, what happened? Unfortunately the dock companies were unable to obtain more capital; so they fell back upon the old resource of making subsidiary companies. The Millwall Dock Company had to form the Millwall Equipment Company; they had more directors, more shareholders, more expenses in connection with that subsidiary company. They divided the 1s. 9d. a ton profit with the old dock company. It was the same with the Victoria Dock Company. The Victoria Dock Company, he supposed, could not raise money for the new machinery which was required, and so they also formed a subsidiary company called the Grain Elevator Company, which worked the trade and divided the profit. He believed that if these dock companies were to work themselves, the goods would be worked out of the vessels easily for 10d. or 1s. a ton. But now, instead of merchandise being worked out cheaper, they proposed to put a heavy tax on all goods entering into London. What the people of the Port of London wanted were cheaper working-out charges instead of the higher charges which the dock companies proposed to put on. These tariff reformers. as he might call them, were not satisfied with putting a tax on food that came into London, but they also proposed to put a tax on barges which carried the food. He thought that London had suffered long enough at the hands of these dock companies and syndicates, and he was convinced that the proposal in the Bill was the worst that could be made for the trade and interests of the people of London. He trusted that the President of the Board of Trade, with his great knowledge and ability, would before very long bring forward a better scheme, in order to deal with the whole question. It was a matter of great regret to the merchants and traders of London that the Bill of 1903 was not carried through. Why it was dropped nobody could ever understand. Whether the Government of the day were afraid of the dock directors who were then in Parliament, or whether they were afraid of the Lord Mayor, who opposed that Bill, he did not know. He felt sure the right hon. Gentleman would fear neither dock director nor Lord Mayor, but would bring forward a satisfactory measure which would help forward the trade of the Port of London.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster) said that this was not a Party question. The late Government introduced a Bill during the last Parliament dealing with the question. The right hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division had stated that he was not quite sure whether the clause dealing with the reconstitution of the Thames Conservancy Board was in order. He wished to point out that that Board held its powers under a private Act passed in 1894, and therefore such a proposal to amend its constitution was within the limits of order.

Mr. ELLIS said what he said was that it must have been in order or it would not have been introduced.

Mr. W. F. D. SMITH said the company could not be blamed for introducing the Bill. They were, he believed, given to understand that in the present session of Parliament the Government would introduce a Bill dealing with the whole subject, and delay in dealing with the question would be most unwarrantable. At the present moment they were no better off than when the Royal Commission reported in 1902. That Report was followed by the introduction of the Bill of 1903, and all who took an interest in the question knew that that Bill had to be withdrawn because it seemed impossible to reconcile those who were in various ways interested in its provisions. He agreed that the withdrawal of that Bill was unfortunate, but under the circumstances he did not think that the Government could have forced it through the House. It was true that since that time the trade of the Port of London had not decreased in the manner predicted by the Royal Commission; during the past few years it had increased, and last year there was a record increase. But that fact, far from suggesting any reason for further delay, seemed to him to be an additional reason for immediate action, because if the accommodation in the Port of London was insufficient in the year 1902 it must be infinitely more insufficient in the year 1907 when the trade had greatly increased. There was at this moment the added advantage that the chances of coming to some agreement amongst the various interests concerned were brighter than they had ever been before. If the President of the Board of Trade could bring together all those interested he would be deserving of their congratulations. As a supporter of the Bill introduced by the last Government he did not for a moment go against the recommendation of the Royal Commission which reported in 1902, but at the same time he wished to state that he saw much danger in any further delay. If the subject was not dealt with now there might be a delay of several years, whereas if this Bill were passed the new docks might be commenced at once. He could well understand that the Government did not desire to prejudice in any way their future action, and if they intended to deal with the whole subject no doubt they would desire to keep a free hand. He would like to know whether it was possible for the Government to allow this Bill to pass and at the same time preserve their own freedom of action. Would it not be possible to place in the Bill some safeguarding provision which would leave the Government perfectly free to act and introduce their own Bill next year? He was anxious that in some way or other it should be made possible for the work to be commenced this year. That was a point which might very well be considered, and he hoped that before the right hon. Gentleman replied he would make up his mind upon it. What he was sure all sections of the House desired was to see the question settled, because they were all anxious that the accommodation of the Port of London should be increased and improved as soon as possible.

*SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central) said he agreed that this was not a Party question, and he took no exception to what had been said as to its urgency. Speaking as one who had been connected with the commerce of London for a great many years, and speaking in the name of the large body of traders represented by the London Chamber of Commerce, he desired to say a few words in opposition to the Bill. The measure was promoted by private companies, who were asking Parliament to impose new burdens on traders, primarily for their own benefit. It was a much larger question than could be dealt with by private companies. More than half the tonnage that came into the Port of London did not use the docks at all, but was dealt with by private wharfowners and the waterside manufacturers. The waterside manufacturers alone represented a capital of £100,000,000, whereas the whole capital of the dock companies amounted to only £24,320,000. These manufacturers had invested that large capital on the strength of free water privileges—privileges which existed before the docks were created, and were safeguarded by Parliament when the docks were sanctioned. It had been said that the shipowners had agreed to the Bill, but it was only the owners of ocean-going ships who were supporting it, and their attitude was very natural, because under it their dues would be lessened. He regretted that the last Government's Bill was not passed, and those who represented London at that time had a great responsibility on their shoulders for the pressure they brought to bear on the Government of the day to drop it. All delay was bad for London. The sphere of influence connected with London, the trade of which must be done practically in the Port of London, was constantly increasing. They must also bear in mind that there was a large class of trade which, if London did not provide for the ships thoroughly up-to-date facilities, drifted not to other British ports but to distributing ports like Hamburg and Antwerp. That trade, having once drifted away, was very difficult to regain. The question was complicated by a variety of competitive interests, but they had to remember that the consumer of the daily necessaries of life was also deeply concerned. The manufacturing industry of London was the largest in the Kingdom. It was split up into an enormous number of specialities. All these varied interests could only be dealt with by a Bill introduced by the Government trying to deal fairly with them. He sincerely hoped that one good result from the discussion would be that the President of the Board of Trade would be able to assure them that there would be no delay in bringing in a Bill. It would not be easy to satisfy all Parties, but for himself he hoped there would be set up a port authority, representative of all interests, which should take over the docks, not by purchase under arbitration terms, but by negotiation, with the understanding that the present proprietors of the docks should be placed in a position neither better nor worse than they occupied at the present time.

*MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) said he was glad that this question had been kept free from the atmosphere of Party. He looked upon a wise solution of the Port of London question as being a most important matter in London's immediate welfare. The present Bill, had, to his mind, two fundamental objections—objections which, he hoped, the Government would be able to avoid. The first was that it continued to rely on private enterprise; and, secondly, it threw the whole cost of the improvement as a burden upon trade. Those objections were both avoided by London's greatest rivals on the Continent. In judging of this question they must remember that it was the Continental ports which were the rivals of London. It was those ports which had been the latest successes, and it was from them that something was to be learned. In none of the Continental ports did they entrust these duties to private enterprise, and in none of them was the whole burden imposed on trade. In every one there had been large contributions from Imperial or local funds. It was no wonder, therefore, that the Royal Commission made this recommendation, in Paragraph 232, of their Report—

> "The power of undertaking large present expenditure and of working for a long time at a loss with a view to compensation in a distant future is, in the keen world competition, an advantage possessed by undertakings which have the force of an empire, state, or great city behind them. If, in some countries national and municipal resources are thus employed, it becomes most difficult for private enterprise elsewhere to hold its own against the intelligent, far-sighted, and formidable rivalry thus created."

Many who had been considering the question had seen the great difficulty of acquiring the docks and the whole of the undertaking because of the large price it would be necessary for the public to pay. He had wondered whether it would not be possible to remove the conduct of the port from the hands of private enterprise, and at the same time not to throw an enormous burden on trade. There appeared now to be pretty general agreement that the pressing necessities of the port were, first, a 35 feet deep channel from the Nore to Gravesend, and a 30 feet deep channel from Gravesend to the Albert Dock; and secondly, new deep water docks 40 to 45 feet deep with entrance locks 900 to 1,000 feet, and dry docks of equal size, Until these new docks had been established London would be unable to accommodate the large ships of to-day. It could not at present dock the "Dreadnought," and unless the improvements were made it would not be able to take in the large ships which in future were going to do the commerce of the world. Neither of these needs was met by the Dock Companies' Bill. The first was the duty of the Conservancy, and the second was beyond the companies' powers and resources. On the other hand both could be performed by a revised Conservancy, having powers to spend £5,000,000. That sum should be raised on a Government guarantee, interest secured by an increase of the tonnage dues of ½d. and ¾d. on registered tonnage, now doubled for three years for a similar purpose. It could not be urged that such Conservancy Docks would be unfair to the existing docks, for they would serve a special purpose for very large ships, new and additional, and would not therefore compete for the same class of business. In that way it was possible to escape from the present dilemma, the necessity of changing from private enterprise to public authority by purchasing the whole undertaking of the dock companies. The purchase could only be made at a figure prohibitive of commercial success, and it would saddle the public with a bargain of the worst description. A dock system, over capitalised, not up to date, administered by a new authority without full experience, would bring discredit to all concerned. Moreover, a heavy burden on the trade of the port would be avoided, for his proposed increase in tonnage rates was very much less onerous than a general rate on all goods imported.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said the hon. Member for Limehouse had based his opposition to the Bill on the fact that its adoption would have the effect of handing over the Port of London to private enterprise. It seemed to him that the hon. Member entirely misundertood the very grave and urgent situation in which they now found themselves. The situation was simply this. Five years ago the Royal Commission reported that the question was urgent. There was nobody who had an interest in, or knowledge of, the trade of London who would not agree that this was really a matter of the gravest importance and urgency. It was perfectly intolerable that, owing to the failure of successive Governments, urgent and necessary improvements should be denied to London, the greatest port in the world.

The hon. Member for St. George's (Tower Hamlets) had said that the Bill imposed new dues. That was perfectly true. They could not have new facilities without new expenses, The hon. Member had also said that this was taking public money for the benefit of private companies. Did the hon. Gentleman know where this "public money" was coming from? Was money derived from a private dock company acting in their own interest what he called "public money?"

*MR. W. BENN said the Bill proposed to put an entirely new charge on the trade of the Port of London. That was what he meant by "public money."

MR. BOWLES said he denied that the money so raised would be in a real sense public money. But all these were points eminently for consideration by a Private Bill Committee upstairs. It was quite idle to expect the House to consider the technical matters involved in this measure with any real advantage. The question was whether, if the Government was unable to find time to deal with the matter itself, there should be another year's delay. On a former occasion the President of the Board of Trade said four things. Everybody, he said, was dissatisfied with the present state of things; that everybody was agreed that the matter was of real and genuine urgency; that what was wanted was primarily dock extension; and, finally, that there should be one authority to manage the Port of London, and that that authority ought to be a public authority. There was nothing in this Bill inconsistent with any one of those four requirements. It was the only attempt they were likely to see in the present year to deal with this important problem, and he thought that the House would be taking a very serious responsibility on itself if, for reasons which had not been avowed, inquiry by a Committee upstairs were refused. This was a great free trade Government, but he would remind hon. Members that there were other hindrances to trade than tariffs, and that a very serious responsibility would be incurred if the House and Government permanently refused to the London dock companies the power to spend money on the development of the Port of London which everybody admitted should be spent. He had no interest in the matter except as a London Member, and he believed that the trade of London would suffer more and more unless this Bill received a Second Reading. Therefore, he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would not allow any mere pique to prevent that Second Reading being taken unless he had some real and grave reasons for denying it.

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he did not see why the Dock Company should be allowed extended powers, and the reason was that they took the shareholders' money and spent it for Party purposes in London elections and were not ashamed. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh."] He had brought up the same question in the case of a Bill promoted by the London and North Western Railway Company. The House would agree with him that he would be acting inconsistently and putting himself under suspicion of favouritism if he did not ask the House to treat all companies in the same manner. On that occasion he, and the House agreed with him, thought that the railway company had done wrong; but the dock company did worse, because in the former case the directors humbly admitted their error to the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order in referring to debates in the same session.

*MR. TREVELYAN said that in the case of the Dock Company it was apparent from a letter which appeared in the papers that the company had entered into a complete and systematic policy of subsidising local elections in London. That appeared to him to be a practical defiance of the views of the House. The letter to which he referred was written in answer to an inquiry by the President of the Board of Trade in regard to the matter. In the letter which had been printed in *The Times*, and was circulated in the Votes for that day, the London and India Docks Company stated that the reason why they gave a subscription to the London Municipal Society was to aid the endeavours of that society "to return members at the recent municipal and guardian elections pledged to economy in local administration." The company went on to point out that they had been acting on this principle for some time, and had subscribed to the West Ham Borough Alliance and Poplar Borough Alliance. And the company further stated that it was because of the success of these alliances at West Ham and Poplar elections that the directors welcomed the efforts of the London Municipal Society in the same direction to secure economy. Of course their operations might have been very successful in the case of Poplar. [An Hon. Member: But not in West Ham.] But supposing, for the moment, that it was true that the exposure of the abuses at Poplar was of great advantage to the public; supposing for the moment that it was true that it was not the activity of the Local Government Board under its present head, but that of the political Party called the Moderate Party which was the sole agency that had brought to light these abuses—it was a very poor Party which did not do something good in the course of its existence—apart from all that, this was a Party organisation, and the dock companies had been helping it. It was the assistance given to a Party which they objected to in regard to dock companies. He doubted whether the House would pass the Bill of a company which gloried in having subscribed to a Party organisation and declared by letter its intention of doing so unless it was absolutely prevented. He thought the House would feel that the matter had become serious, and he hoped the Government would have something to say either on this or some other occasion to prevent this state of things by bringing forward legislation. But, whether the Government were prepared to bring forward legislation of that sort or not, it appeared that the House had before them an unrepentant company and, in his opinion, they ought to take the opportunity of teaching it a lesson. He hoped the House would take that view, as the sooner they got a public authority which did not dabble in politics the better. Until they did get such an authority he hoped the House would not grant any further powers to companies which had taken such action.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) thought the point of view of the hon. Gentleman was admirably illustrated by the last phrase which he used, that he desired to teach this Company a lesson. [Opposition cheers and Ministerial counter cheers.] He was not surprised to find that that was a fair sample of the opinion of the bulk of the Liberal Party. Let them see exactly what the Dock Company had done. He thought it would be for the advantage of the debate if he read the letter, which the President of the Board of Trade had published that morning, written on behalf of the London and India Docks Company. That letter was the whole of the knowledge he possessed on the subject and gave the actual facts of the case. The letter was as follows——

Sir,—The directors have had before them your letter of the 12th instant. They have no objection to stating that they subscribed £100 to the funds of the London Municipal Society in December last, and they are advised that under the judgment given by the Court of Appeal on November 19th, 1906, the contribution was a perfectly legal one.

Their reason for giving the subscription was to aid the endeavours of the London Municipal Society to return members at the recent municipal and guardian elections pledged to economy in local administration.

The Company, like all proprietors of industrial undertakings in and near London, have suffered grievously from the excessive local rates levied upon them. Rates have been increasing for many years past, and there has been no remedy open to the Company in the municipality itself, for although they pay a large proportion of the rates in every locality in which their docks are situated, they have absolutely no voice in the election of the persons who spend their money.

The only course open to the Company, therefore, is to support reputable organisations which are founded to educate voters as to the peril to them of the increase of municipal burdens and to expose the mismanagement of particular local institutions. Acting on this principle my directors have subscribed to the West Ham Borough Alliance and the Poplar Borough Alliance. Both of these alliances have been remarkably successful in the work, and it may be within the knowledge of the Board of Trade that they have been active agents in bringing to light the notorious scandals which have been the subject of recent official inquiry in these two boroughs; indeed in the case of the inquiry into the administration of the Poor Law at Poplar the alliance was officially recognised by the Local Government Board's representative as the body chiefly responsible for proving the charges made against the guardians. In Poplar alone, as a result of the action taken by the alliance, there will be savings in expenditure at the rate of £70,000 a year, which will be shared by the whole of the ratepayers of the borough.

It was because of the success achieved at Poplar and West Ham that the directors welcomed the efforts of the London Municipal Society to apply to those matters in which London as a whole is concerned the same reforming energy which has been applied locally at Poplar and West Ham.

The directors observe that it has been charged against the London Municipal Society that it is a political organisation. No ground for such a charge is to be found either in the rules or the statement of objects of the society. No political test for membership is imposed; and as a fact there are persons belonging to both the Unionist and Liberal Parties amongst its members, and on the council is Sir F. Schuster, who was the Liberal candidate for the City of London at the last general election.

The directors, amongst whom are adherents of both sides of politics, would certainly not continue their support to the society if they had any reason to believe that its aims were political; but no evidence has come before them to show that there has been any conduct on the part of its managers which indicates a departure from the spirit of its constitution.

That was the defence of the London and India Docks Company. The charge of subscribing to a political object was dealt with in the letter, and if it was a technical charge it was sufficiently met by the Company's observation that they had been advised that under the decision of the Court of Appeal they were well within their rights in the action they had taken. He therefore did not rest his observations on any technical ground but went to the larger and more substantial objection which he understood was raised. The objection raised was to the existence of trusts, to the power of money being used to affect political elections. That was the real charge which lay at the basis of this question. He was one of the last to deny that the power of money so used was a serious danger to democracies in all parts of the world. But the danger was not confined to companies. It was as great in the case of private individuals. In fact it was greater, because statutory companies were compelled to publish accounts, and if any money was used for these purposes it could be traced on those accounts. He had had a short experience of the House but a lengthy experience in Private Bill Committees, and he submitted that the practice of utilising the procedure on private Bills to forward objects not connected with those Bills ought to be very carefully watched. He protested against the practice. Where the action was private no one would defend it, but when it was political it was a very dangerous weapon to use. He hoped the House would not countenance this attempt to achieve a political end, whether good or bad, by supporting an Amendment which would put an end to a Bill intended to forward a wholly different object, and which had nothing whatever to do with political corruption or the maintenance or otherwise of the Progressive Party.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE) said he would rather not enter on the questions raised by the two last speakers and he did not propose to put the action of the Government on this Bill on the ground suggested by his hon. friend the Member for the Elland Division. He could not agree that this was the case of a private company entitled to do what it liked with its own assets. It was the case of a company which owed its existence to Parliament, which had a Parliamentary monopoly, and whose revenue depended on privileges and powers conferred by Parliament, coming now and asking for power to levy tolls outside its own territory in order to pay a dividend of 4 or 5 per cent. where it was now paying nothing. The noble Lord, in reading the letter of the London Dock Company, said there was no political test for membership of the London Municipal Society.

LORD R. CECIL: I was merely reading the letter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was the claim put forward by the dock company, but he believed it was also put forward by the Tariff Reform League. He would like to know from the noble Lord if in his opinion the Tariff Reform League was not a political organisation. It would be rather interesting to get his view.

LORD R. CECIL said he was the last person in the world to apply to for information about the Tariff Reform League.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was the very reason why he had asked the noble Lord—because he thought the noble Lord was the last person in the world to endorse that claim. The noble Lord with regard to the Tariff Reform League had acted fairly and with impartiality of judgment, and he only asked that that fairness and impartiality of judgment should be extended to the operations of the London Municipal Society. He would rather discuss the Bill altogether apart from that question, because he wanted the House to believe that the action of the Government had not been dictated or inspired in the slightest degree by any notions they might hold with regard to the subscriptions of great corporations in receipt of Parliamentary powers. He would deal with the merits of the Bill itself. He did not believe that the supporters really anticipated that it would go through the House. On the contrary, he believed that it had been introduced simply for the purpose of raising a discussion on the whole question, and with that object in view he thought that perhaps they had rendered a public service, although he thought that it might have been done at much less expense by bringing on a Motion than by promoting a Bill. The Government could not possibly give support to the Second Reading of this measure. If the Bill were carried it would enable these private companies to levy a toll upon practically all goods that came into the Thames. They contemplated that out of the revenue thus raised they should receive a dividend in respect of one company of 4 per cent., of another 6 per cent., and of a third 4 per cent. The first of these companies was at present earning about 2¼ per cent., the second 5 per cent., and the third had not for at least six or seven years paid a penny in dividend. He did not think the House could possibly contemplate carrying a Bill which would have the effect of placing a permanent burden on the trade of London for the purpose of providing for these companies the dividends which he had mentioned.

Sir E. BOYLE said that the company which paid no dividend was a very small one.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was the old plea, that it was only a very little one. The Millwall Company was only a small one, he agreed, but still that was the general proposition which he stated. The companies had never proposed to eliminate Clause 18 from this Bill. That would have been a totally different proposal. They meant to adhere to Clause 18, and the only thing they proposed was that, as far as the new dock was concerned, it should be valued on the basis of a 4 per cent. dividend. The next consideration was well known to them, that if they put in a provision of that kind it would be practically guaranteeing a dividend of 4 per cent. in the Bill, and the hon. and learned Gentleman well knew that any arbitrator would take that into account, with the result that the value of the docks in London would be increased. Therefore, the hon. and learned Gentleman, as far as he was concerned, had not affected the general character of the argument Another point with regard to the Bill was that it had not the support of the trades of London at all. The Chamber of Commerce were against it, the riverside manufacturers were against it, the grain and flour people were against it, and so were the timber trade. It was true the shipping trade at first, induced by a probable reduction of 6d. per ton, gave a kind of qualified assent to it, but they subsequently withdrew that, and now they trusted the Government would see that something was done to improve the Port of London. But that was not supporting the Bill proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman, whose measure would have no effect in improving the Port of London. In these circumstances, the Government had come to the conclusion, after most careful consideration, that they could not possibly support the Second Reading of the Bill, which, if passed, would unfortunately have the effect of embarrassing the Government when they came to deal with the question. The Bill, if the docks were purchased, would give them an artificial value by conferring on the dock companies these powers.

Sir E. BOYLE was understood to say that the right to 4 per cent. as to the new dock only lasted four years, and as to the whole of the rest of the docks the Bill made no difference.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman at all; and he said so after very careful consideration with those who advised him as to the whole effect of the Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman knew perfectly well that, in a Bill of this kind, to increase Parliamentary powers, to increase the revenues to the extent of hundreds of thousands of pounds a year, when the property at the present moment was not in a very solvent condition, and when one company could not pay a dividend to its ordinary shareholders—

SIR E. BOYLE: No, no!

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. and learned Gentleman must really let him finish his sentence. As far as one dock company was concerned it had paid no dividend; as far as another dock was concerned it had paid only 2¼ per cent. and had been paying 1¼ per cent.; and as far as the other dock was concerned it was paying 5 per cent. With any Bill of this kind giving Parliamentary powers, and increasing the revenues to the extent of hundreds of thousands a year, surely the hon. and learned Gentleman, with his experience, must know that it would enormously increase the security and the real value, as a marketable asset, of the whole concern. Therefore when the Government had before them the prospect of having to deal with the whole problem of the port of London, it must take into account all questions of this kind, which might have an appreciable effect in connection with the introduction of a Bill. Therefore, when the Government had before them the prospect of dealing with the whole problem of the port of London they must be influenced by these considerations, and would not be justified, for the sake of one year, in supporting a Bill of this kind, which might eventually embarrass them very considerably in the settlement of the whole problem. Probably that answer would not be considered quite sufficient. He agreed that the Government ought to deal with the subject as soon as possible, and he was authorised to say, on their behalf, that it was their intention to deal effectively with the problem in the course of the next session of Parliament. It could not be done this session, because the Standing Order required that notices should be given in November. He knew he said something not quite so definite last year, and he thought it might have been done even this year if there had been the slightest prospect of getting any general agreement among the parties interested. He had seen representatives of every one of the interests concerned, but it appeared hopeless to expect agreement. He had met representatives of the waterside manufacturers, the Corporation of London the Thames Conservancy Board, the London County Council, and others interested and there was not one deputation which agreed with another, there were no two men on the same deputation who agreed, and as far as the Thames Conservancy was concerned the moment one man made a proposal his neighbour got up and repudiated it on the spot. That was the nature of the problem with which he had to deal, and he did not think there was a more difficult problem to deal with even in Ireland. He denied the statement which had been made that this was an easy problem to deal with, because the various interests concerned were far from coming to any common basis of agreement. He did not know whether there was any probability of coming to an agreement before November, but if no solution was arrived at by that time the Government would suggest the best course, taking into account all the circumstances of the case. Some things had emerged out of the controversies, and two or three things must be regarded as part of the necessary basis in any general treatment of the subject. The objects to be attained were agreed upon. There must be further port facilities, a deepening and widening of the channel an improvement in the accommodation for berthing, discharging, collecting, and distributing. These were objects upon which there would be general agreement. The second consideration was that it must be dealt with by a public port authority. They could not leave the problem to any private company; there must be one public authority dealing with the whole problem of the port. At the present time he was told that there were over fifty authorities which had some kind of finger in the pie. There ought to be an end to all that. The third consideration was that the trend of public opinion was against having the control of the river given to any individual municipality. In his judgment that involved as a necessary corollary that no single municipality should have a majority of the representatives on that public authority. The other proposition he laid down was that the general public must be represented apart from the payers of dues, for he did not think that the public authority ought to consist exclusively of representatives of those who paid tolls and dues in the Thames. The best means of securing the representation of the general public was by means of nominations of Government departments and the municipalities concerned. Opinion also seemed to be hardening against the compulsory purchase of the docks. He was expressing no opinion on the subject; he was merely pointing out that there seemed to be a growing opinion in that direction, a growing tendency to protest against the idea that the docks must be purchased compulsorily. It was said that compulsory purchase inevitably meant that they paid twice as much for a thing as it was worth, and the traders said that if more was paid for a thing than it was worth it would always be a burden on the trade of London, for some one had to pay for it, and the effect would be to increase the charges in the river and make the port of London more expensive than at present, without obtaining an adequate return for the outlay. After all, when they came to settle the problem the interest of London must be the paramount consideration, and not the interest of any private company. There was capital which had been invested in the docks 100 years ago, a good deal of it dead capital, capital which would have been wiped out long ago by a municipal sinking fund. Those docks were purely and simply private enterprise, which had paid high dividends for over twenty years, but they had neglected to make provision for a sinking fund which would have wiped out most of their capital long ago. Surely they were not justified in coming forward now and asking that they should be paid back the whole of that money. That would be imposing a burden on the port of London which would not in the slightest degree bear comparison with that on Continental ports. He did not think that ought to be allowed in any Government Bill. The next point which he would like to state for the consideration of those who would have to give their opinion eventually upon the best method of dealing with the port was this: To secure the necessary improvements some dues on goods or ships, probably on both, would be required, and he believed that traders were prepared at least in principle to accept that necessity. He did not think they would agree to anything like the Liverpool scale of charges. There was a pretty strong feeling expressed by all the traders who came before him that the Liverpool schedule of charges was too high, but he thought every section was prepared to contribute something. The only condition raised by many traders was that the dues should not be used for the purchase of docks, but for the purpose of improving the river. A good deal had been said in the debate about a Government subsidy, but the Government could not hold out any hope of any subsidy being given to the port of London. It was said that the Imperial Government had contributed a considerable sum of money to the competing port of Hamburg. But in Germany they had only two or three ports of any consequence, while in the United Kingdom we had six times as many ports to deal with. If a Government subsidy were to be given to the Port of London, then Newcastle, Liverpool—where it was proposed to spend many millions of money—Bristol, Cardiff, and all the other great ports of the United Kingdom would want their fair share of Government contributions. Whether the London County Council or the Corporation of London would see their way to contribute anything was a different matter. It was not for him to lay down any proposition on that point, it was purely a question for the London County Council and the Corporation to think out for themselves. He trusted they would not decide the matter in a hurry, but that before the Government gave notice of their proposals they would be able to make up their minds to assist in the matter. If the port was to be an effective competitor with the great Continental ports, millions of money must be spent in deepening the channel and improving the facilities, especially for discharging and distributing cargoes. The facilities at Antwerp and Hamburg were the means of an enormous saving of time, and the equipments there were superior. To effect such improvements as these was the only way in which the end desired could be achieved, and it was because he felt that any effective method of dealing with the problem would be embarrassed by the carrying of this Bill that he invited the House to throw it out.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said the President of the Board of Trade had asked the House to reject the Bill on the ground that the Government was going to introduce a Bill on the subject next session. Was the Government Bill to be an alternative to this measure? He understood from the right hon. Gentleman that the Government Bill would recognise the fact that no municipal authority should be the body entrusted with the affairs and fortunes of the Port of London.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That Income Tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)—resumed.

Question again proposed.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

LOCAL TAXATION GRANTS (CONSOLIDATED FUND).

Committee to consider of authorising the payment of certain Grants to Local Taxation Accounts out of the Consolidated Fund, instead of out of the Revenues out of which they are payable under the present Law (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Adjourned at ten minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 23rd April, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Standing Orders Committee. Report from, that the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with.

That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the petition for additional provisions in the Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.] and the Midland Railway Bill [H.L.] ought to be dispensed with, and leave given to the Committees on the Bills to insert the additional provisions.

Read, and agreed to.

Baines' Name Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with an Amendment.

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [H.L.]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill; Bude Gas Bill; Falmouth Gas Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed.

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, that the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 25th of February and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed.

Royal Insurance Company Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, &c.) Bill [H.L.] A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the councils of the administrative county of Surrey and the county boroughs of Birkenhead and Southport to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts—Was presented by the Lord President (E. Crewe); read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 35.)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3765. Saxony (Leipzig).

No. 3766. Wurtemburg (trade and agriculture).

No. 3767. Turkey (Adrianople).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Treasury minute, dated 16th April, 1907, sanctioning the sale of a plot of land at Kingstown known as Battery Plot, together with a further plot adjoining the municipal baths, to the Kingstown Urban District Council: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

THAMES CONSERVANCY.

General Report of the Proceedings of the Conservators of the River Thames during the year ended 31st December, 1906, with Statement of the Accounts of the Conservators of the River Thames for that year: Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): My Lords, this is a Bill to which I apprehend there will be no opposition, because it is in accordance with a series of its predecessors the object of which has been to revise and, if possible, simplify the statute law. If this Bill passes, I hope it will lead to the edition being carried down to the end of the last

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

century, which is nearly co-terminus with the end of the reign of Her late Majesty. The work has been conducted with great care and very successfully handled by the noble Earl who preceded me on the Woolsack. I hope this useful work of revision will be continued.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I should like to say a few words in reference to this Bill, but not in the least to oppose it. The work was inaugurated many years ago, and has been satisfactorily carried out. The Committee selected for this purpose is, of course, composed of eminent men in whom complete reliance is placed, but in the nature of things, as will be seen from a glance at the enormous Schedule of this Bill, a great amount of drudgery is required and a great deal of attentive and minute examination of a vast number of Acts of Parliament. It could not possibly be expected that the eminent personages on the Committee would themselves, in the first instance, wade through all this mass of material, and I therefore assume that others, who will work under their directions, must be entrusted with the initial duty of examining the statutes. I would venture to express a hope that the gentlemen chosen for this work will be men whose avocations and studies have led them to acquire a mastery of the reading of Acts of Parliament, and that nothing will be done lightly or hastily.

I have no doubt that in the main what the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has said is entirely correct, that the work has been done with accuracy and care; but in the very nature of things it is inevitable that there must occasionally be mistakes. Therefore it is obviously essential that the most extreme care should be taken in the selection of those who are given the primary duty of examination. That is a matter to which I have no doubt the noble and learned Lord will give attention. I would like to know whether in the selection of the gentlemen who are to give assistance to the Committee there is any division of labour, and whether the different classes of work are considered. I am more closely associated with Ireland, and I would suppose that someone acquainted by training and knowledge with Irish laws would be employed in reference to the revision of statutes relating to Ireland. The same remark would apply to Scotland. It would also be desirable to secure that statutes relating to important branches of the law should be read in the first instance by someone with special knowledge. That, I think, is an obvious consideration which would suggest itself to the mind of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack.

I am aware that the introductory words of the revised edition of the statutes are very wide as to savings and exceptions, and it is not easy to say what is the effect and how far the repeal and revision really operates at present in law. In the full and interesting note which is appended to this Bill it is pointed out that regard is to be had to Acts of Parliament that are superseded and are deemed to be obsolete and so on. But then there is the suggestion that preambles and recitals are to be left out. I am not sure how far that is wise. It may be wise in some cases, but I do not think it is wise in every case to lay down the rule that you will not in any circumstances print the preambles or recitals. They might be very useful in discussion, it might be desired to refer to them in argument, and they might reasonably be used to elucidate the history of the statutes. It is a matter of great importance that the code of law should be shortened, and I am confident that the noble and learned Lord will apply himself to see that the revised edition proposed in this Bill is brought out in the most satisfactory and useful way.

There is one other point on which I should like to say a word. Judges, barristers, and others connected with the law find it a matter of great inconvenience in some cases that there is no reference at all in the revised edition to clauses that are omitted, and this necessitates in the case of many important statutes referring to the original Act to see what clauses have been left out. I venture to think it would be a great advantage in many cases if the more important clauses that are omitted could be included, with an intimation in red ink that they had been repealed. These are not matters easy to accomplish, but I think the effort is worth something.

The Earl of HALSBURY: My Lords, I think I ought to say that for a good many years this work of revision went on under my supervision, and I have no reason to suppose any different method is being pursued now. Certain expert persons, amongst them very distinguished lawyers, were employed to see what the statutes were which it was intended either to consolidate or to put into form; they were persons in the habit of preparing Bills brought into Parliament on behalf of the Government. After they had prepared their suggestions, a Committee was summoned to consider the suggestions, and each amendment to each statute was looked at with great care. No statute was subjected to revision or amendment without being distinctly brought before the whole Committee, which sometimes included learned Judges and sometimes Members of the other House.

The work of the Committee afterwards came before the House as this Bill does to-night. One result of the work has been that statutes which formerly were in 110 volumes were reduced into ten volumes. Of course I am speaking of the same editions and the same print. The effect of that was valuable in many ways. The work was discontinued because an hon. Member in the House of Commons thought it right to object to this form of producing the revised statutes, and I myself said that if that was the mode in which the matter was to be discussed after it had gone through this process in this House—if, notwithstanding, it was to be discussed as if it were a new Bill—I would no longer be responsible for asking a number of distinguished men to act with me in the matter. From that time, when one of these Bills was rejected in the House of Commons for the reason I have stated, this work has been discontinued. I can only say that I very heartily welcome the renewal of that procedure, and I have no doubt the work will be well and accurately done. The consolidation and correction of the forms of the statute law has been brought down to 1886, and so far as I know not a single mistake has been made. I heartily support the Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

RULE COMMITTEE BILL [H.L].

[Second Reading].

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, this Bill received a Second Reading last year and passed through your Lordships' House. Its object is a very modest one. It is to provide that there should be two solicitors on the Rule Committee instead of one. I might have hoped that so unambitious a project would have succeeded in obtaining legislative sanction, but it was found impracticable in the other House to pass it last session. I cannot help feeling that there is inconvenience to public Departments through perfectly uncontroversial Bills not being able to secure a passage through Parliament without great difficulty. This is a mere departmental administrative difficulty, and, being of a sanguine temperament, I hope that the Bill may now succeed in obtaining the consent of both Houses of Parliament.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord ALVERSTONE: My Lords, I desire to support the Second Reading of this Bill. Although, as my noble friend has said, this is a small measure, it is one to which considerable importance is attached by the solicitor branch of the profession. Having worked on the Rule Committee for many years I think it will be a very great advantage if we have a larger number of men on that Committee who are acquainted with the practical working of the administration of justice from the solicitor's point of view. I sincerely trust the Bill will pass. I think there is a slip in Clause 1 which will require attention. It is provided that the persons in whom the power of making Rules of Court under the Judicature Acts is vested shall include four persons, but only three are described. When the Bill is in Committee I think it will be necessary to put in some definition of the fourth person who is to be added to the Committee.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

JUDICATURE BILL [H.L.]

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, it will perhaps be expected that I should say one or two words to explain why this Bill, which I described as urgent, has not been brought forward for Third Reading before. The reason is that some controversy has apparently arisen; and I have received communications indicative of hostility, which I cannot say is unusual in the legal profession towards legal reform. My desire is that objections should be considered maturely and upon their merits, and there is nothing I should like less than to hurry through Parliament a Bill to which exception is taken. Therefore I postponed the Third Reading until now.

It is possible that this Bill will now embark upon a more stormy course than it has hitherto experienced. I can only say the object of the Bill is not to split the Court of Appeal into Courts consisting of two members each. It is a Bill merely to provide for so doing where the Lord Chancellor is satisfied that there is a special cause. It is not a Bill intended to affect the work of the Court of Appeal as a regular rule, but only temporarily to deal with an emergency which everybody admits—namely, the unfortunate block of business in the Court of Appeal, an accumulation that is still slowly increasing rather than diminishing. I am sure that anyone responsible for the management of the judicial business of the country would feel bound to take some step in order to meet this great difficulty. I do not propose to suggest any Amendments at this stage. But I desire to treat this Bill as an uncontroversial measure, and so long as its main effect is not impaired, the Government will be inclined to consider impartially any improvements that may be suggested.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I am entirely in favour of this Bill, treating it as a measure designed to meet an emergency. My judicial experience has convinced me that if two people sit together and form the same judgment, the other side has not so good an opportunity of being heard as would otherwise be the case. I have been struck by the admirable manner in which the work of the Court of Appeal has been done; and I wish to bear my testimony to the extreme care with which even trivial cases have been sifted and adjudicated upon by that tribunal.

It is impossible, owing to the altered condition of things, to make a comparison between the Court of Appeal and the old Court of Exchequer Chamber. I think a certain absence of familiarity with the condition of things that then existed has led to an unfavourable comparison being made between the two Courts. It is not easy to bring to the attention of your Lordships, although some of you are lawyers, the technical difficulties that surrounded the Court of Exchequer Chamber. The Court of Exchequer Chamber only heard what are technically known among lawyers as errors, and I suppose not one case in twenty of those that are subject to appeal could be brought before the Court of Error.

Certain regulations were made in relation to the higher Courts. By an Act of William III. the Exchequer Chamber and others were regulated, and finally I think in 11 George IV. and 1 William IV., there was some improvement made, but one difficulty existed. Until 1852, when what is known as the Common Law Procedure Act was passed, there was the whole cumbrous proceedings of writ of error, joinder in error, assignments in error, every one of these steps expensive and delaying; and the Court of Exchequer Chamber itself had no certain time to sit and no certain constitution of its members, and one reason why the Court of Exchequer Chamber was not very slow in disposing of its business was that there was no business to do. The people who complained of judgments could not get there. But in 1852, under the Common Law Procedure Act, there was a little more approximation to judicial determination of every question in dispute brought before the Courts.

The principle of two Judges disposing of matters on appeal certainly has been tried under very favourable circumstances. Lord Justice James and Lord Justice Mellish, two of the most eminent lawyers who ever sat on the English Bench, gave entire satisfaction sitting as a Court of two. I do not, however, support this Bill on the ground that I think two Judges should constitute a Court permanently. I have thought it right to say these few words not only because I am a member of the Court of Appeal myself, but because I think undue complaint has been made of the Court of Appeal. The delay arises in a great measure from an increase in litigation, and people do not seem to remember that a great deal of the law has been altered. When I was first called to the Bar the people whow knew most about the question in dispute were excluded from the witness box, and the art of *nisi prius* at that time was a cunning game of chess. But wiser counsels have since prevailed. The result is that you have doubled and trebled the amount of litigation that was possible under the old system, and this has led to a block of business in the Court of Appeal. That Court has most diligently and ably fulfilled its functions, and is in no way deserving of the criticism which has been passed upon it.

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, I am sure it will be a great satisfaction for the legal profession to hear the statement which the Lord Chancellor has repeated this afternoon, that there is to be no permanent reduction in the number of Judges in the Court of Appeal. That particular matter has been the subject of representations made to me, and I know to other members of the Bench, from persons who are absolutely friendly to His Majesty's Government and have the strongest faith in everything which my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack may do; but the experience of the last few weeks has shown us that difficulties may arise from Courts of two, and I am sure that the announcement that the Lord Chancellor has made to-day will very much assist in another place the passing of this Bill, which I believe to be absolutely necessary. I am afraid that on the last occasion I availed myself of the opportunity of uttering a cry in the wilderness. But the numerous communications that I have received and the study which I have given to this project confirm me in the opinion that the subject must at no late date be looked at from a larger standpoint. It will really be necessary to consider whether the number of Judges is sufficent to deal with business as it is now conducted. Whether or not the number of cases can be reduced I am not sure, but I am quite sure that the matter cannot be dealt with permanently as in this Bill, and that some further reforms will be absolutely necessary.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I agree with the noble Earl in regard to what he said about the Court of Appeal. We would indeed be ungrateful if we did not recognise the immense self-sacrifice and labour which have been exhibited by that Court, but they really have been of late overweighted, and I am anxious to relieve them. That is the purpose of this Bill. With regard to what my noble and learned friend the Lord Chief Justice has said, his cry was not a cry in the wilderness; on the contrary, since he made his speech, it has been pondered over and thought over by myself. I agree with him that the larger aspects of this question must be considered, and I contemplate considering them without delay, with a view of seeing whether some further amendment of a permanent character may be needed. I do not know whether it is so or not, but I think it might very fairly be carefully considered, in order to see whether some further steps are needed.

On Question, Bill read 3^a and passed, and sent to the Commons.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD (CHARGES, ETC.) BILL.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

Commons' Message of the 26th of March last considered (according to order), moved that a Committee of Five Lords be appointed to join with a Committee of the House of Commons to consider the said Bills as mentioned in the said Message; and that the said Committee be named by the Committee of Selection (The Earl Carrington); agreed to; and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at five minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 23rd April, 1907.

The House met at a Quarter before Three of the Clock

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

South Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill.—As amended considered; to be read the third time.

Taff Vale Railway Bill.— As amended considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4 Bill).—Read a second time, and committed.

Brighouse Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Standing Orders.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee :—

"That, in the case of the Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided the powers of guarantee and of raising money and applying their funds proposed to be conferred upon the county council of the county of Meath be struck out of the Bill unless proof be given to the Committee on the Bill that the county council of the county of Meath have approved the Bill with or without modification in the manner prescribed by Standing Order 67 :—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

"That, in the case of the Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

"That, in the case of the Great Central Railway Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with :—That the parties be permitted to insert the additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

Resolutions agreed to.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.—(*Mr. Deputy Chairman.*)

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.

Petition from Woolwich, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table.

FEUS AND BUILDING LEASES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dalziel, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; from Arbroath; Inverness; Kirkwall; and Peebleshire; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) ((SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Aberdeen (three); Ancrum; Ardrossan; Ayr; Ayrshire; Beauly; Birsay; Bridge of Allan; Broughty Ferry; Butterburn; Cadder; Castle Douglas; Cromarty; Cupar; Dalbeatie; Dalkeith (two); Darnick; Denny; Dumbarton (two); Dundee (two); Dunipace; Dunoon; Edinburgh; Fraserburgh; Gamrie and Macduff; Glasgow (seven); High Blantyre; Innerleithen; Invergordon; Inverkeithing; Inverness; Kilbarchan; Kilmacolm; Kilmarnock (two); Kilsyth; Kingussie (two); Kirkcudbright; Kirkwall; Kirriemuir; Larkhall; Lesmahagow (two); Lochbroom; Lochcarron; Lochee; Maybole; Nairn; Newmilns; Paisley; Pollokshaws; Port Glasgow; Portnahaven; Renton; Riccarton; Ringford; Sanday; Stevenston; Stornoway; Strichen; Stromness;

Tarbert; Thurso; Tillicoultry; Turiff United Free Church of Scotland (two); Uyeasound; and, Westerdale; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation; from Isle of Thanet; and, West Bromwich; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from West Bromwich, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports (Annual Series), Nos. 3765 to 3767 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND)

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 16th April, 1907, sanctioning the sale of a plot of land at Kingstown, known as Battery Plot, together with a further plot adjoining the municipal baths, to the Kingstown Urban District Council [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Thames Conservancy.—General Report and Accounts of the Conservators for 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 124.]

EAST INDIA (DEATHS FROM PLAGUE, ETC.)

Address for "Return showing the number of Deaths and the Death Rates per million living in India for each of the last thirty years from Plague, Cholera, Enteric or Typhoid Fever, and Small Pox respectively.'—(*Sir William Collins.*)

BOARD OF TRADE (REPORTS).

Copies ordered "(1) of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Great Central Railway Bill; and (2) of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Admiralty Contracts in Ireland.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state approximately the value of the contracts placed by the Admiralty with contractors in Ireland in the last financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The total value of contracts placed with Irish firms during the financial year 1906–7 is approximately £43,000. This does not include local orders for the supply of fresh meat, provisions, &c., placed by ships in Irish waters.

Stoppages for Lost Time in Dockyard.

Sir JOHN BENN (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a shipwright who, having been summoned by telegram, was allowed to leave his work 2⅓ hours before bell-ringing, on 22nd December last, was checked five hours pay; and, if so, whether he will take steps to prevent employees, under such circumstances, being checked for more time than they actually lose.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*)—This man was checked five hours pay, in accordance with the regulation that workpeople leaving the yard more than two hours before bell-ringing are to be checked half a day's pay. In view, however, of the adoption of an hourly rate, steps will be taken to revise this regulation, as to prevent men being checked for more than the time actually lost. I may add that this man made no complaint to the Dockyard officers, and that, had he done so, his case would have been favourably considered.

Building of the "Dreadnought"—Return of Ship Fitters' Assistants to their Shops.

Mr. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that, at the beginning of the building of the "Dreadnought" in Portsmouth Dockyard, men were taken from the different shops and sent to work on that ship; that some were put on the ordinary labourer's work known as under the boatswain, whilst others were sent as riveters, drillers, caulkers, and chippers; and, seeing that, after the "Dreadnought" was finished, the men from the blacksmiths' shops and hosemakers' and plumbers' shops went back to their respective foremen, will he explain why the ship fitters' assistants under the chief constructor were not similarly treated, but are still distributed about the yard.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The facts are not exactly as stated, as the men still detached from shops include some taken from other than fitters' shops, the requirements of the service not having permitted of the return of all the men to their previous duties. Their case will be considered when the condition of the work permits.

Post Office—Limited Competition for Male Learners at Dublin.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Postmaster-General under what circumstances a limited competition for male learners has been announced to be held in Dublin in April; is he aware that the limits of age are such as to prohibit postmen and those serving for some time as auxiliary sorting clerks and telegraphists from competing; and will he say for whom the vacancies are intended.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A limited competition for male learners at Dublin was held on the 17th instant to fill vacancies which at present exist in the class of learner. The competition is restricted to telegraph messengers and other unestablished persons with at least one year's continuous service in the Post Office. The officers to whom the hon. Member refers are not required to pass through the class of learner. As I explained to the hon. Member for West Wicklow on the 12th ultimo, they will, in due course, be permitted to take part in a limited competition for direct appointment to the class of sorting clerk and telegraphist.

Direct and Indirect Taxation in Great Britain and Ireland.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state the relative percentages of direct and indirect taxation in Great Britain and Ireland in the past financial year, and what he estimates those percentages will be under his new proposals next year.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The relative percentages of direct and indirect taxation for the two years are estimated for Great Britain and Ireland respectively as follows —

	Direct Taxes. Per cent.	Indirect Taxes. Per cent.
1906–7.		
Great Britain - -	52·7	47·3
Ireland - - -	27·3	72·7
1907–8.		
Great Britain - -	51·9	48·1
Ireland - - -	27·0	73·0

Officers' Extra Pay for Brevet Rank on Sea-going Ships.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the total increase of pay and allowances, including any pay of extra staff, due to officers being given brevet rank in sea-going fleets.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The total increase of pay and allowances, including the wages of additional domestics, amounts to approximately £3,460 a year; but it must be distinctly understood that this does not represent any additional cost to the nation, but only the difference between the ordinary pay and allowances of the four officers in question and those attaching for the moment to their acting rank, which is determined by the importance of the station.

Separation of Executive and Judicial Functions at Sind.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that in March, 1904, eleven resident magistrates were appointed in Sind to form a separate service, and that a protest was received from the Sind Hindu Sabha, on 27th November, 1906, against recent orders amalgamating these appointments with the Revenue Department; and whether, considering the desirability generally of separating judicial and executive functions, he will consider the expediency of reverting to the arrangements of 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have no information as to the recent orders mentioned, but I will inquire.

Payment of Deputy County Court Judges in England and Ireland.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will grant a statement showing the total amount of daily remuneration for the five financial years ended 31st March, 1906, paid to deputy county court Judges in Ireland and England respectively; the average daily remuneration paid to each deputy county court Judge for the same period in Ireland and England respectively; and whether such daily remuneration has been paid in every case by each county court Judge for whom each deputy was acting.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Deputy county court Judges are paid ordinarily by the county court Judges out of the salaries of the latter, and the Treasury has no knowledge of the amounts so paid throughout the year. I regret, therefore, that I am not able to give the information asked for in the first two parts of the Question. As regards the last part, in certain cases where there is a vacancy for the judgeship or where the Judge is absent from his circuit on duty elsewhere, the deputy is paid out of the Votes for county courts.

Appointments to the Colonial Audit Branch.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state under what authority and under what regulations the Colonial Audit Branch in London was formed under the Comptroller and Auditor General in 1889; under what authority was the power of making clerical appointments to this branch conferred on the Comptroller and Auditor General; whether the Comptroller and Auditor General had power conferred on him of nomination to appointments as auditors in certain Crown Colonies and Protectorates abroad; if so, under what authority; what authority fixed the salaries of these nomination appointments at home and abroad; and whether the cost of housing of the Colonial Audit Branch in London was paid for out of Imperial funds from 1889 to 1906, without any appropriations in aid being received from the various Crown Colonies and Protectorates in respect thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Colonial Audit Branch was formed by the Comptroller and Auditor General, at the request of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and with the sanction of the Treasury, to undertake the audit of the accounts of various Colonies. In accordance with regulations framed with the concurrence of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, all appointments to the Colonial Audit Branch, both at Home and in the Colonies, were vested in the Comptroller and Auditor General. The salaries of the staff in the Colonies were approved by the Secretary of State for the Colonies; the salaries of the staff at headquarters were fixed by the Comptroller and Auditor General on the scales generally in force for the main office. With regard to the last paragraph of the Question the hon. Member is referred to the Answer given him on 7th March, 1906.†

Treasury Grants to Upkeep of Government Department Luncheon Rooms.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will grant a statement showing the special Treasury allowance to each Government Department towards the cost of the upkeep of its luncheon room, where there is one; the total cost to the State, including housing accommodation, fire, light, etc., of each of such luncheon rooms; the names of the Government Departments in which the staff has the option of lunching outside the building; and the names of the Government Departments in which the staff is not allowed such option, with the reasons for this prohibition where it exists.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The information for which the hon Member asks would take much time and labour to prepare, and I venture to doubt whether any proportionate result would be achieved. The Answer to the first part of the Question, however, can be readily obtained from the published volume of the Civil Service Estimates.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 432.

The Colonial Audit Branch.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the terms on which the Colonial Audit Branch was recently amalgamated with the Exchequer and Audit Department; whether the Comptroller and Auditor General is allowed the right to transfer auditors from the various Crown Colonies and Protectorates to the newly amalgamated Colonial Audit Branch and Exchequer and Audit Department; whether one of these auditors with a salary, with allowances of nearly £500 per annum and only seventeen years service, who was neither a civil servant nor a university graduate on his first appointment to the Colonial Audit Branch, and who did not pass a Civil Service examination on admission to the branch, was recently transferred from Gibraltar to the amalgamated Departments in London; if so, whether he is now in receipt of nearly £500 per annum with allowances out of imperial funds, ranks higher, and receives over twice the salary of his fellow clerks of the same length of service who secured their appointments after success in Civil Service open competitions; if so, whether such procedure is in accordance with the terms on which the Colonial Audit Branch has been amalgamated with the Exchequer and Audit Department; and for what reason was this official transferred from Gibraltar to London and another official sent from London to Gibraltar in his stead.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The essence of the new scheme is that the appointment of auditors and assistant auditors in the various Colonies concerned will be made from the staff of the Exchequer and Audit Department, and transfers will consequently take place between members of the staff at Home and in the Colonies. The transfer referred to was carried out in the interests of the public service and without detriment to individual prospects.

Guaranteed Irish Land Stock.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state of £12,756,120 guaranteed land stock, $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., redeemable not before 5th August, 1921, how much has been exchanged for Consols, and at what price; how much has been purchased by Government, and at what price; how much has been extinguished, and at what price; how much is in hands of private investors; how much is lodged in court to the credit of estates sold under the Land Purchase Acts of 1891 and 1896, still unallocated; and what is the total outstanding amount of above stock now, and by whom is it held.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*)—

		£
At 31st March, 1907, the total amount of Guaranteed Stock, issued under the Land Purchase Acts of 1891 and 1896, was - -		13,635,373
of which there has been cancelled, as the equivalent of a similar amount of cash - - - - -		894,595
Leaving still outstanding		12,740,778
Of this balance the National Debt Commissioners have given Consols in exchange, stock for stock, to the nominal amount of -	£7,950,000	
and have, on balance, purchased at an average price of $96\frac{1}{4}$ - -	1,068,030	
		9,018,030
Leaving a balance of -		£3,722,748

which is held by the public and other Government Departments. I have no information as to the stock held otherwise than by the National Debt Commissioners.

North China Campaign—Special Promotion for Naval Officers.

Sir JOHN BENN: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the captain and paymaster of H.M.S. "Algerine," and the captains of His Majesty's destroyers "Fame" and "Whiting" received special promotion for their services in the North China campaign of 1900, and if the engineer officers who were in charge of the machinery of those vessels have received any reward or recognition; and, if not, whether he will secure equal treatment in such matters in all branches of the Navy.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The captain and assistant paymaster of the "Algerine" and the commanding officer of the "Fame," were specially promoted for services in North China, 1900. The commanding officer of the "Whiting" did not receive promotion. The engineer officers of the "Fame" and "Whiting" have not received reward or special recognition. All branches of the Navy receive equal treatment in this respect, according to the nature of their services, which are carefully considered by the Admiralty. It may be mentioned that several engineer officers received special promotion for war service in South Africa and China.

Pay of Chargemen in Portsmouth Dockyard.

MR. BRAMSDON: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether chargemen of labourers in the different departments of Portsmouth dockyard receive the maximum rate of pay as skilled labourers, namely, 28s. per week and 1s. per day charge-money, with the exception of the department under the chief constructor, where they receive 25s. per week and 1s. per day charge-money; if so, will he state the reason; and whether their Lordships can see their way clear to make all the departments identical in this respect by being paid the higher wage.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The hon. Member would appear to have been misinformed as to the facts of the case, as there are established chargemen in the constructive department receiving the maximum rate of pay.

Waterford and London Mails.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether letters for London and the South of England, posted in Waterford and district after the departure of the 3.40 p.m. train which runs in connection with the night mail service by Holyhead, are despatched by the train leaving Waterford by the Rosslare and Fishguard route at 10.35 p.m.; and, if so, will he say at what hour are letters despatched by the 10.35 p.m. train from Waterford by Rosslare delivered in London on the following day.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is a despatch of letters from Waterford to London by the Rosslare and Fishguard route by the 10.35 p.m. train; and the letters for the London town districts fall into the deliveries commencing about or soon after 11 a.m. on the following day.

Board of Trade Advisory Committee on the Merchant Shipping Act.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state how many members have been appointed on the Advisory Committee of the Board of Trade under The Merchant Shipping Act, 1906; how many of the members are shipowners or persons interested in shipping; how many are shipbuilders, and whether they are also owners or share-owners in shipping property; whether he can state if Captain Trenery, who has been nominated by the Merchant Service Guild, is a shore superintendent of the Johnson Line of steamers; whether Mr. Shera, one of the members of the Committee, was formerly superintendent and engineer for several shipping companies; how many members of the Committee personally represent seamen; and whether he will take into consideration the appointment of additional representatives on the Committee who have no interest in shipping property.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Advisory Committee to which my hon. friend refers consists of nineteen members. Of these five were nominated by the Shipowners Parliamentary Committee, and two are shipbuilders or naval architects. Captain Trenery was nominated by the Merchant Service Guild as a representative of masters and officers; Mr. Shearer and another gentleman represent the marine engineers; and two representatives of seamen and one of firemen were nominated by the Seamen and Firemen's Union. The remaining members of the Committee are two underwriters, a second representative of masters and officers, and three nominees of the Board of Trade, of whom one is my hon. friend, the Member for Limerick City, and the other two are shipowners. I know nothing with regard to the private interests, past or present, of the individuals nominated by the various bodies to represent them on the Committee, the composition of which was decided at a meeting at the Board of Trade at which representatives of seamen were present. I regard the Committee as fairly representative of the interests concerned; and I am not prepared at present to add to the number of its members.

Income-Tax Returns.

Sir F. DIXON - HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his scheme making it compulsory on every man to make a declaration and send back a return, on the well-known buff form, of his total income, though it may be taxed at the source, is to be the total amount of such income, or whether the whole of the items are to be given of the hundred and one sources, however small, from which it may be composed.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. Returns of total income, whether taxed at the source or not, will, as hitherto, only be required from persons claiming relief. I only propose to compel the taxpayer to return on the "buff" form what he is asked to return upon it now, viz., income upon which he is assessable, and if he has no such income to make a "nil" return.

Labourers' Cottages at Cootehill.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Cootehill No. 1 Rural District Council have rejected a number of agricultural labourers' representations for cottages on the ground that the labourers applying reside in the urban district of Cootehill; and, in view of the fact that these men are compelled to live in the town owing to want of accommodation outside, and that they are employed by farmers in the rural district, will the Local Government Board's attention be directed to their claims.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It appears from the rural district council's minutes that of 108 representations lodged ninety-six were approved by them. Twelve representations in the Cootehill electoral division were apparently rejected on the ground that the applicants are residing and working in the urban district of Cootehill, and that the urban district council should proceed in such cases under the Housing of the Working Classes Act. Any applicant aggrieved can appear before the Local Government Board's inspector at the local inquiry into the scheme of the rural district council, which will be held in due course.

Reinstatement of Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Thomas Brady.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement of Thomas Brady, who was evicted from the estate of E. P. Smith, Bellamont Forest, Cootehill; were agreements for the purchase of this estate signed as far back as November, 1905; was it agreed at the time of sale that the evicted tenants were to be restored; and will the Estates Commissioners explain the cause of delay in the above case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Thomas Brady, who appears to be the son of Thomas Brady who was evicted in this case. As the latter is still alive the son is not eligible for reinstatement under the Act. The Commissioners are not aware that it was a condition of the agreement for sale of the estate that the evicted tenants should be reinstated but inquiries on the subject will be made before the advances are sanctioned. The purchase agreements in the case were lodged in September, 1905, and the estate has not yet reached its turn to be dealt with.

Return of Local Contributions.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return of Local Contributions of which notice stands upon the Order Paper.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I will offer no objection to the granting of this Return, but it will take some time to prepare, as the particulars will have to be obtained from local authorities.

Condition of Irish Cattle.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, some time since, unfounded allegations were made respecting the prevalence of tuberculosis amongst Irish cattle, mainly cows: whether he is aware that those allegations have been disproved; whether, in conjunction with and the co-operation of the Board of Agriculture of Great Britain and the Department of Agriculture in Ireland, he will inquire into and prevent the practice of certain dealers purchasing English cattle and selling them as Irish on account of the superior healthy character of Irish cattle; and whether he will consult with the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland and the President of the Board of Agriculture of Great Britain, and have an arrangement made that the Irish national trade mark shall be branded on all cattle exported from Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Department of Agriculture are aware that currency was given some time ago to a statement that tuberculosis is prevalent among Irish cattle. This statement appears to have expressed the personal opinion of its author. Tuberculosis is not scheduled under the Diseases of Animals Acts, and no comprehensive statistics are therefore available. The Department, however, are not aware of any reliable evidence which would go to support the statement referred to. The general reputation of Irish cattle as to healthiness is undoubtedly high. Inquiries are being made as to the alleged practice mentioned in the second part of the Question, and when the result of these inquiries is known, the Department will be in a position to consider what action can be taken in the matter.

War Office Contracts in Ireland.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office, whether he can state approximately the total value of contracts made directly by the War Office with contractors; the names and amounts of any such contract placed with contractors in Ireland; the average strength in officers and men stationed in Ireland; and the average cost of victualling per head per year.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The total value of the contracts, concerning which the hon. Member desires information, made direct with Irish firms (eighteen in number) amounted to about £64,000 last year; the total for all similar contracts was £1,200,000. The specific information required as to names and amounts cannot be published. The average strength of officers and men stationed in Ireland, including Militia recruits, is about 28,000. The cost of victualling per head of these troops (excluding officers) is about £8.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Cadets.

Mr. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to the statement of the First Lord that the cost of the thorough education given to naval cadets at the two Naval Colleges obliges the Admiralty to call upon the parents for a substantial contribution towards it, upon what principle a reduction in the charges is made in the case only of officers of the Navy and Army who can show that the fees paid are a serious burden; whether the present system restricts the area of selection; how large an additional sum would be involved if the whole cost of this education were placed upon the Navy Estimates; whether he is aware that in the United States Navy a system of nomination of cadetship is adjusted to democratic conditions by the State's undertaking the whole cost of the cadet's education and training until he attains a rank in the service at which his pay enables him to support himself.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. E. Robertson, Dundee): The reduction of fees in favour of a limited number of sons of naval and military officers in poor circumstances has long been an established custom in the entry of cadets for the Navy. As regards the area of selection, the number of candidates is roughly three times the number of vacancies. The additional cost in the present year if the whole charge were placed upon the Navy Estimates would be £55,000. As regards the last part of the Question, I believe it is a fact that in the United States the whole cost of the cadet's training is borne by the States from the time of his entry at an average age of eighteen.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Have the Admiralty received any offers from local bodies or other authorities in response to the appeal made by the First Lord?

MR. E. ROBERTSON: Not so far as I am aware.

Brevet Rank Pay and Allowances.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, what is the total increase of pay and allowances, including any pay of extra staff, due to officers being given brevet rank in sea-going fleets.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The total increase of pay and allowances including the wages of additional domestics, amounts to approximately £3,460 a year; but it must be distinctly understood that this does not represent any additional cost to the nation, but only the difference between the ordinary pay and allowances of the four officers in question and those attaching for the moment to their acting rank which is determined by the importance of the station.

Command of the Maltese Garrison.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether, in the future, the Governor of Malta will continue to command the troops stationed in that island, in view of the fact that it has been decided to appoint a General Officer to command all the troops stationed in the Mediterranean.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The functions of the Governor and his title will be unchanged. He will command the troops in Malta as at present. He will, of course, be subject in this command to the authority of the Commander-in-Chief of the Troops in the Mediterranean.

Eastern Command Auxiliary Forces.

MR. A. L. LEVER (Essex, Harwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether, having regard to the falling off in the number of Auxiliary Forces, Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, which go to Colchester for their annual training, and in view of the special facilities offered for musketry by the existing ranges, and for manœuvring and field exercises by the additional Government ground acquired in the immediate neighbourhood of Middlewick and vicinity, he will augment the numbers this year so that the Auxiliary Forces may participate in the advantages to be derived from a standing camp.

MR. HALDANE: The arrangements for the training of the Auxiliary Forces in the Eastern Command have already been made for this year by the General Officer Commanding in Chief, and I am afraid that no changes can now be made.

Survey of India.

DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, what are the duties and salary attached to the office of mathematical expert to the Survey of India; when was the office created; by whom is the appointment authorised to be made; and what is the process of selection adopted on the occurrence of a vacancy.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The expert is required for the difficult mathematical operations which the work of the Survey involves. One such post has existed since 1885. A second has now been created as the work has increased. Mr. Hunter's salary commences at the equivalent of £600 a year and will rise in the course of eighteen years to £1,280. The appointment rests with the Secretary of State in Council, and was made after full inquiries as to possible candidates both of British or Indian nationality possessing the requisite qualifications.

DR. HAZEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, what are the age and University distinctions of Mr. J. H. Hunter, who has been recently appointed to the office of mathematical expert to the Survey of India; and whether any attempt was made to secure the services of one of the distinguished mathematicians of Indian nationality who have taken the highest honours at the University of Cambridge and elsewhere.

MR. MORLEY: Mr. Hunter was bracketed twelfth wrangler in the Cambridge Mathematical Tripos, 1903, and obtained a first class in the Mechanical Science Tripos, 1904. His age is twenty-six. I have already said that the qualifications of such mathematicians of Indian nationality as were available were duly considered. I may perhaps say that the office was offered to, and declined by, an Indian who had taken a high degree at Cambridge.

Lahore Demonstrations.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention has been called to the recent demonstration at Lahore in regard to the imprisonment of the proprietor and editor of an Indian paper for publishing a seditious statement, when the police, who were conveying the prisoners from the court to the gaol, were stopped by a large crowd of natives who pelted them with mud, and crowned the prisoners with garlands; also to the fact that the crowd afterwards paraded the street and assaulted every isolated European they met, until dispersed by the police; and, as this is a repetition of what happened at the second trial in February last, he now proposes to take steps to prevent the recurrence of such demonstrations.

MR. MORLEY: The local authorities have power to deal with these disturbances and will no doubt take all possible precautions against their recurrence. The duties of Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab have just been taken up by Sir Denzil Ibbetson, one of the most experienced and trusted officers in the Indian Service.

New Hebrides—Trade in Intoxicating Liquors.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether his attention has been called to the recent complaints regarding the sale of intoxicating liquors to the natives of the New Hebrides, and to the statement that some French steamers recently left Sydney, New South Wales, carrying large stores of liquor for those islands; and whether he will take adequate steps to safeguard the welfare of these people.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to complaints that a large quantity of spirits from French sources is still imported into the New Hebrides; and they are in communication with the French Government on the subject. They have, however, no information to the effect that intoxicating liquors are imported in any quantity from Sydney, either in British or French vessels; and by a proclamation of the 28th November last their exportation from the Commonwealth to the New Hebrides is prohibited, unless a permit has been first obtained from the Comptroller-General of Customs.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire if any liquors have not recently been imported into the New Hebrides from Sydney?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

Port of Spain Borough Council.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that some time ago a petition, signed by practically the whole of the ratepayers of the Port of Spain, was presented, asking for the restoration of its elected borough council (which it enjoyed for a period of fifty years); that the prayer of the petitioners has not been acceded to, but that instead a wholly nominated town board has been set up for a period of three years, with a commissioner at a salary of £800 a year; whether, in view of Lord Elgin's statement in a despatch of 21st June last, that his decision was therefore that there shall be for two years a board, he will state why it has been made three years instead of two; and whether, at the end of the three years, the elective principle will be restored.

MR. CHURCHILL: The petition was duly received and carefully considered. The Secretary of State's decision was intimated in the despatch to which the hon. Member's Question refers, and with the purport of which he is no doubt acquainted. The Governor reported that an Ordinance to give effect to the Secretary of State's decision would be introduced at the session of the Legislative Council, which opened on the 4th of February. It is not known whether the Ordinance has yet been passed by the Council, and no intimation has been received from the Governor as to whether or not it is proposed to appoint the new board for three years instead of for two years, as originally contemplated. With regard to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, the decision in the Secretary of State's despatch of the 21st of June, 1906, was that at the end of two years "the question whether the existing board shall be continued or shall be replaced either at once or gradually by an elected board shall be again submitted to the Legislative Council," and it is impossible at present to add anything to that decision.

Public Works at Tangier.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that a contract for public works at Tangier has been given by the Moorish Government to a German firm; whether the circumstances under which it was given are a violation of the Act of Algeciras; and, if so, what steps His Majesty's Government, as one of the signatories of that Convention, propose to take in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): A question of this kind has been raised respecting a particular contract at Tangier. It is one which, no doubt, will be settled on the spot in accordance with the provisions of the Algeciras Act, which every Government desires to uphold.

MR. ASHLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct His Majesty's representative at Tangier to deal with the matter under Section 108 of the Act?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I do not see any need for special instructions on the matter.

Youthful Offenders Bill.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the importance of preventing children and young persons from being sent to prison in default of payment of fines, the Government will consider giving facilities to the Youthful Offenders Bill.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The effect of the Probation of Offenders Bill which is now before this House will be to substitute in many cases a new mode of dealing with offenders for fine and imprisonment. I hope that the provisions of the Bill, if it passes into law, will be specially taken advantage of in juvenile offender cases. Much as I sympathise with the object my hon. friend has in view, I am afraid special facilities cannot be given to this Bill.

Qualifications and Appointment of Quarry Managers.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Eifion division of Carnarvonshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any supervision is exercised by the Home Office with regard to the qualifications and appointment of quarry managers; and, if not, whether, in view of the fact that the percentage of fatalities among inside workers in slate quarries in 1905 was nearly double that in coal mines, and that there have been six lives lost in Carnarvonshire already this year, he will appoint a Committee of Inquiry, with a view to the Amendment of the Quarries Act.

MR. GLADSTONE: There are no statutory requirements at present as to the appointment or qualifications of quarry managers. This is a point which has already been noted for consideration when I can find an opportunity for amending the Quarry Act. Having regard to the complication of the existing legislation on the subject, I have decided to consult the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Mines, with a view to advising His Majesty to include the consideration of accidents in quarries in the reference to the Commission.

Poor Prisoners' Defence.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many applications have been made under the Poor Prisoners' Defence Act at the Central Criminal Court and at the county of London sessions; how many have been refused; and, if any, what are the grounds of such refusals.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am informed that at the Central Criminal Court there have been 394 applications made under the Poor Prisoners Defence Act since it came into force, of which 290 have been refused. At the London sessions it has not been possible to get out complete figures, but during 1906 there were 111 such applications, of which 107 were refused. These figures are exclusive of the applications made under the Act to the committing magistrates. The Act itself specifies the conditions on which payment can be made from public funds for the defence of prisoners in criminal cases—he must disclose his defence, and his own means must be insufficient, and applications under the Act are necessarily refused when these conditions are not fulfilled.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would consider the desirability of amending the Act in view of the large proportion of refusals.

Mr. GLADSTONE said he would confer with the Attorney-General, who had more to do with this matter than he had.

West Jesmond Off-licence Case.

Mr. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the decision of the magistrates at the recent annual sessions at West Jesmond, Newcastle on-Tyne, whereby they refused to grant an off-licence to a house in the locality, and to the fact that the interested person has since secured an excise licence for the same premises; and can he say whether he intends to introduce new legislation, or what steps, if any, he proposes to take to deal with such cases.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have had my attention drawn to this case, and have made inquiry about it. The facts are substantially as stated in the Question. The sale by retail of intoxicating liquors without a justices' licence, of which this appears to be an instance, is a matter which has already occupied my careful consideration in connection with the proposed Licensing Bill.

Medical Examinations of Workpeople.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a paper read before the English Ceramic Society by Dr. Shufflebotham, an acknowledged authority in lead poisoning, in which he urges that certifying surgeons should be provided with a private room in each factory for the periodical examination of workpeople, to avoid the present superficial examination in semi-public offices; and whether the Home Office will inquire into the conditions under which these examinations are carried on with a view to possible improvements.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have not myself seen the paper referred to, but in the covering letter issued with the Earthenware Special Rules of 1901, manufacturers were informed that arrangements should be made to allow due privacy for the medical examination required under the rules. The health register in use at each pottery contains the following instruction:—"In order to secure due privacy it is requested that the surgeon may have the exclusive use of a room or office while he is conducting the examination." The Medical Inspector of Factories has made special inquiry into this subject, and I learn that one of the four certifying surgeons in the Staffordshire potteries had no complaint to make of unsuitable rooms being provided for his examination of workers or of want of privacy; and in the very few cases mentioned by the other surgeons, in which the intervention of the medical inspector was necessary, there was no difficulty in securing better conditions. As regards the alleged superficial nature of the present examination, I may point out that all that can be done on factory premises in the way of physical examination is to observe the objective signs of absorption of lead into the system, which are very few, namely, blue line on gums, anæmia, and weakness of fingers or wrist. In cases where the certifying surgeon considers a further examination necessary he arranges for the workman to attend at his surgery.

Clare Lunatic Asylum Sewerage Scheme.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade will he inquire into the cause of delay in not returning plans of sewerage from the Clare Lunatic Asylum to the inspectors of lunatics, in order that the sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant be obtained to carry out the works, those plans having been forwarded to the Board of Trade eight months ago, and notices published in the Dublin and local papers over four months ago, asking for any objections to the sewage works being carried out, and stating that within twenty-one days the Board would proceed in the matter; whether he is aware that a serious epidemic of typhoid fever broke out at the asylum owing to the alleged defective sewerage, by which several of the patients lost their lives, and the sanction of the Board of Trade became necessary owing to the fact that the sewers are to be carried over a small stream subject to tidal influence that runs dry in the summer season; and that the principal owner and occupier of the adjacent lands gave his sanction to the project months ago.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The first communication in this matter from the Dublin Office of Lunatic Asylums was received in August last, but it was not until October that the necessary plans were forwarded to the Board who, in the same month, gave instructions for the application to be advertised. The Lunatic Asylums Office, however, demurred to the newspapers prescribed by the Board for the advertisement, with the result that proofs of the advertisement were received only on 5th January last. On receipt of these proofs the owners of property adjacent to the site of the proposed works were at once consulted by the Board of Trade, but one of them—though written to more than once—neglected to reply, thus causing delay. The Board of Trade have now informed the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums that they are prepared to consent to the works on certain conditions. I have no information as to the matter referred to in the last part of the Question.

Cost of Post Office Services in Scotland.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the amount of revenue for Post Office services in Scotland for the five years ending 31st March, 1907, and the cost of the said services for the same period.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The information for the year which ended on the 31st ultimo is not yet available. For the four previous years, it is as follows:—

Year	Revenue. £	Expenditure. £
1902–3	1,798,000	1,427,000
1903–4	1,866,000	1,445,000
1904–5	1,912,000	1,479,000
1905–6	2,004,500	1,581,000

Wage Receipts.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that a receipt for wages, even if over the amount of £2, does not require a stamp to be affixed, he will issue instructions that the custom of causing post office servants to so affix stamps to their wages receipts be discontinued in the future.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: There is no foundation for the premiss that a receipt for wages of £2 or upwards is exempt from stamp duty.

Royston Head Teachership.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W. R., Skipton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the two members of the West Riding education authority who reported upon the head teachership of the Royston School, have for some years been members of the staffing committee, one of them being the chairman, and are consequently specially experienced in making the staffing appointments throughout the Riding, and that their clerk had previously been a school inspector, and was consequently specially experienced in dealing with children and testing the efficiency of teachers; will he say whether the Board of Education has ever issued any regulations that the duration of visits to schools shall exceed forty-five minutes; that more than fifteen minutes shall be spent with the children in the school; and that more than six questions in geography and mental arithmetic shall always be asked of the children.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I understand that the facts stated in the first portion of my hon. friend's Question are correct, but I have no information as to the accuracy of the conclusions which he draws from them. The Board have no jurisdiction to determine what evidence a local education authority may require upon which to base a decision as to the educational unfitness of a teacher, and they have not, therefore, issued any regulations on the subject.

Elementary School Rifle Corps.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board of Education is in favour of having rifle corps attached to public elementary schools; whether instructions have been issued to inspectors to suggest to head masters of public elementary schools that their influence should be used during school hours to induce boys to join such rifle corps; whether the Board of Education is aware that at Galley's Field Upper Standard School, Hartlepool, targets are exhibited in the school, and boys have been taken out of school before the time for closing shown on the official time table for the purpose of receiving instruction in sighting, and for practising shooting on the rifle range; and that boys have been reprimanded in school for being absent from such instruction.

MR. MCKENNA: No instructions have been issued to inspectors of the kind suggested in the hon. Gentleman's Question, and I should not favour the issue of such instructions. The Board have no information as to the incidents referred to in the latter part of the Question, but I will cause inquiries to be made.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Is it not the fact that at Lewisham forty out of forty-five elementary schools joined the Schools' Rifle Association?

*MR. SPEAKER: This Question relates to Hartlepool, which is a long way from Lewisham.

Board of Agriculture Offices.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W. R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is now able to state whether the Government propose to take any steps to improve the existing accommodation of the Board of Agriculture.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury, for Mr. HARCOURT): The First Commissioner is considering the matter; but regrets that he is unable to make any statement on the subject at present.

New Government Buildings at Whitehall.

MR. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works what Government Departments are to be accommodated in the new buildings in Whitehall; and what is to be the eventual use to which the old War Office in Pall Mall is to be put.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Board of Education and the Local Government Board will be accommodated in the new public offices as soon as they are ready for occupation. The most westerly portion of the old War Office, Nos. 80, 81, and 82, Pall Mall, is occupied by the Barrack Construction Department. The two houses adjoining, Nos. 83 and 84, will be occupied by the Office of Woods pending the rebuilding of their offices in Whitehall Place. All other houses have been surrendered to the Office of Woods, and the eventual use of these premises is a matter for that Department.

Licensing Compensation Appeals.

COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the delay of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue in dealing with appeals under the Licensing Act, 1904, in respect of compensation in cases where the renewal of licences has been refused by the county licensing authority;

whether he is aware that, in consequence of such delay, eighteen licensed houses in Monmouthshire, which twelve months ago were declared unnecessary or unsuitable, still remain open for the sale of intoxicants; whether the machinery for dealing with the large number of similar appeals from all parts of the country exists in the office of the Commissioners; and whether he will take steps to render operative the Licensing Act, 1904.

MR. RUNCIMAN: In six of the eighteen cases in question the full details required by the Board of Inland Revenue have not yet been obtained from the claimants, and it is not desirable to deal with cases from any district otherwise than together.

City of London Charities.

SIR D. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Crewe Division, as representing the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, whether the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, during the year ended 31st October, 1906, distributed out of moneys received by them from the Trustees of the City Parochial Charities to the churches of St. Mary, Aldermary, and St. Peter, Cornhill, the sums of £250 and £100 respectively, for repairs to their organs, in addition to the annual sums which they are authorised to pay for the maintenance of the fabric of the said churches, and for the ordinary cleaning and repairs of the said churches and the ornaments thereof by the Central Scheme of 23rd February, 1891; if so, by what authority, having regard to the terms of the City Parochial Charities Act, 1883, and the said Scheme, are these payments justified; and whether the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, during the year ended 31st October, 1906, made an additional annual grant of £60 to the church of St. Alban, Wood Street, out of moneys received by them from the Trustees of the City Parochial Charities, notwithstanding the provisions of Clause 49 of the Central Scheme of 23rd February, 1891, forbidding such increases.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): The grants voted by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in 1906 out of the residuary income of the City Church Fund paid over to them by the Central Governing Body of the City Parochial Foundation are set out in the Appendix No. 32 to the Annual Report of the Commissioners recently presented to Parliament, and they include the three grants mentioned in the Question. The annual sums authorised by the Central Scheme of 23rd February, 1891, to be paid for repairs of the fabrics of (amongst others) the churches of St. Mary, Aldermary, St. Peter, Cornhill, and St. Alban, Wood Street, and for the maintenance of the services of those churches, are payable by the Central Governing Body before any residue of income becomes payable to the Commissioners. There is nothing in the City Parochial Charities Act, 1883, or in the Central Scheme of 1891 to preclude the Commissioners from making to churches entitled to payments from the Central Governing Body other grants out of the residuary income paid over to the Commissioners. The grants in the cases of St. Mary, Aldermary, and St. Peter, Cornhill, were voted by the Commissioners in the exercise of their discretion in the application of the residuary income within the limits prescribed by the Act of 1883. The expenditure upon the organs was of an altogether exceptional nature. In the case of St. Mary, Aldermary, the repairs have been completed at a cost of over £1,200; in the case of St. Peter, Cornhill, the projected expenditure is not less than £1,000. The grant of £60 towards the maintenance of the services in the church of St. Alban, Wood Street, was made by the Commissioners in pursuance of an Order in Council of 1894 relating to the Union of the Benefices of St. Alban, Wood Street, and St. Michael, Wood Street. By this Order the Commissioners were directed out of such moneys as should from time to time be received by them under the provisions of the City of London Parochial Charities Act, 1883, to make such a grant as would raise to £220 per annum the funds available for the maintenance of divine service in St. Alban's Church, which was thenceforth to serve as the church of the united parish. The grant of £60 raises the provision of £160 per annum under the Central Scheme of 1891 to the sum of £220 so fixed. The church of St. Michael, Wood Street, was demolished, and the annual payments of £45 and £250 directed by the Scheme of 1891 to be made by the Central Governing Body out of the City Church Fund for the benefit of that church ceased and fell into the residuary income payable to the Commissioners.

Kilshanny Evicted Tenant.

MR. HALPIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mary Organ, of Carrowerah, Kilshanny, West Clare, aged eighty-four years, was served with an ejectment on 7th December, 1906, and secondly served on 15th January, 1907, and evicted on 8th March, 1907; and that the landlord, Lord Inchiquin, or his agent, Mr. Edward O'Brien, was offered two years rent as a settlement, and declined; if he will inquire of the Estates Commissioners why they did not reply to the tenant's application for reinstatement; and is he aware that a gamekeeper is grazing the evicted farm without the consent and against the wish of the tenant.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N): The Estates Commissioners have not received a formal application for reinstatement from Mrs. Organ, but have received a letter from her in which she states that she was evicted on 8th March last, and asks for the Commissioners' assistance in the matter. The Commissioners have hitherto limited their intervention to the cases of evicted tenants who were evicted before the Act of 1903 was passed, and they do not propose to inquire at present into cases of eviction since the passing of the Act. Such cases will only be inquired into in connection with the sales of the particular estates on which the evictions took place. The Commissioners have no knowledge of the facts of the particular case.

Athenry Outrages.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received police reports upon the occurrences of 13th March in the neighbourhood of Athenry when shots were fired into the house of a man named Tierney and stones were thrown into the dwelling of Mrs. Raftery; whether the last named was injured by this assault; and whether these persons are now protected from a repetition of such attacks.

MR. BIRRELL: The reply to each part of the Question is in the affirmative. The police are paying special attention to the locality with a view to the protection of the persons referred to.

*MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that more crime is committed in the Brigg Parliamentary Division than in any four counties in Ireland.

[No Answer was returned.]

Ballinageeragh Rioters.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenent of Ireland whether he has received police reports to the effect that, for a considerable time past, a number of men in the district of Ballinageeragh have been hiding from the police in order to escape arrest from warrants issued against them on a charge of riot at an eviction; whether repeated efforts have been made, under circumstances of hardship, to execute these warrants; and whether he is taking steps to ensure that the King's writ shall run in county Cork.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers, may I ask him whether he is aware that the persons referred to in the Question have voluntarily surrendered to the magistrates some days ago, and that the case is now *sub judice*?

MR. BIRRELL: That is practically what I was about to say. The offence referred to, which took place in September last, consisted in a riot on an evicted farm, but not at an eviction. Five of the offenders were dealt with at the last winter assizes. Others against whom warrants were issued succeeded in evading arrest, being assisted by the difficult and mountainous nature of the country. Two of these have recently been apprehended, and twelve have surrendered to the police; and the case against all these persons is now *sub judice*. The two remaining accused persons are believed to have left the country.

Munster Rents.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the average reduction given on the fixing of second-term judicial rents by the Land Commission, first, in Munster, and, secondly, in all Ireland during the past twelve months; has it been the invariable practice of the Land Commission valuers to appreciate the land as they found it without making any allowance for the outlay of the tenants and the improvements effected by them; and whether, seeing that the terms suggested in the Land Conference Report were based upon second-term rents reduced by 22 per cent., do the reductions at present obtained by tenants bear any approximate relation to this figure.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed by the Land Commission that during the twelve months ending 31st March last the average reduction given on the fixing of second-term rents was, in Munster 19 per cent, and in all Ireland 18·6 per cent. In fixing fair rents the Land Commission pay due regard to the provisions of the Land Law Acts as judicially interpreted by the Supreme and other Courts in numerous decisions. Section 1 of the Land Law Act, 1896, requires the Court, when fixing a fair rent, to record in a schedule, unless both landlord and tenant shall otherwise request, certain particulars, including the improvements made wholly or partly by the tenant or at his cost, and the deduction from the rent made on account of such improvements. This statutory direction is, the Commissioners inform me, invariably obeyed.

Queen's County Evicted Tenants.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what is delaying the reinstatement of John Tynan to his holding at Derry Keeran, Raheen, Mountrath, on the estate of Sir Kildare Burrows; and whether, in view of the fact that Michael Dillon, an evicted tenant upon the Sheane estate, also in Raheen parish, has been reinstated, although the sale upon the Sheane estate was subsequent to that of the estate of Sir Kildare Burrows, he can explain the delay in dealing with John Tynan's application.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are in negotiation with the owner for the purchase of the holding in this case, with the object of reinstating the evicted tenant. The Commissioners have not yet been able to come to an agreement with the owner as to price, but are making further inquiries in the matter. There has been no undue delay in the case.

Albemarle Estate Evicted Tenant.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Thomas Scollen, Corlishen, Drumsna, for the farm of land in Corlishen, on the Albemarle estate, in county Leitrim, from which his father was evicted about twenty years ago; and, if so, will an inspector be sent to investigate the case.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estate Commissioners have received the application in question and have had the case investigated. The present occupant of the evicted farm is unwilling to surrender it, and as the Commissioners understand that the evicted tenant received compensation when leaving the holding they have decided to take no action in the matter.

Dublin Civil Servants.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what functions are exercised by Sir R. W. A. Holmes, K.C.B., Treasury Remembrancer at Dublin, with reference to applications for promotion forwarded to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury by the heads of Irish Government departments; whether he is aware that a feeling exists among Dublin Civil Servants that their advancement is in no wise proportionate to the increases granted to Sir Robert's personal staff; whether he will state, with reference to Messrs. J. T. Drennan, H. P. Boland, and E. Fahey, who were successively personal clerks to Sir Robert, what would be the present amount of their salaries if those of them who were entitled to annual increments received them, but no other promotion, from the date of their first appointment to the Treasury Remembrancer's office; what is the amount of the present salary and allowances of each of these gentlemen; whether there are any other instances in the Dublin Civil Service of either temporary or permanent clerks receiving such rapid advancement as has been given to these clerks; and whether he can arrange that other Dublin Civil Servants can be afforded equal opportunities to Sir Robert's staff when opportunities for promotion arise.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I have made inquiries respecting the substance of this Question, and I am satisfied that there is no foundation for the insinuations which it contains against an officer of high distinction who has earned the confidence of successive Boards of Treasury. The hon. Member has put to me several Questions containing reflections on the personal character of public officials, for which I have found no evidence, and I must take this opportunity of adding that I shall in future decline to answer further inquiries of this kind.

Mr. DELANY: May I be allowed to ask the Prime Minister whether he will provide a gramaphone for the Treasury Bench in order to answer such Questions?

[No Answer was returned.]

At the end of Questions:

Mr. DELANY asked Mr. Speaker whether it was in order for any Minister to refuse to answer Questions placed on the Paper regarding his Department or to announce in anticipation that he declined to answer in future Questions put to him.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the Secretary to the Treasury refused to answer any Questions the hon. Member might put to him, but only certain Questions of a particular character. He said that if Questions of that character were put he would not undertake to answer them. I cannot compel any Minister to answer; he must use his judgment in each case as to whether an answer is desirable or not.

Mr. DELANY: To whom shall I in future address Questions in order that I may get an Answer? Is it to be to the clerks at the Table?

*Mr. SPEAKER: The only duty of the clerks at the Table is to see that the Question is framed according to Parliamentary traditions and order. It remains with the Minister to decide upon public grounds whether it should be answered or not.

Mr. DELANY: Am I to consult the Secretary to the Treasury as to whether a Question I wish to ask him is of the character he approves?

[No Answer was returned.]

Dublin Post Office Employees Grievances.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been drawn to complaints with reference to the treatment meted out to his employees in the Dublin office; is he aware that the annual increments of several officers have recently been stopped for such offences as a hasty word over the wire to a clerk of equal rank; was it with his sanction that an officer has been fined £5 4s. who had not a single late attendance in the course of a year, and who only had five minor irregularities in the year's work; is he aware that such an officer would have been granted his increment quite readily a few years ago; and whether, in the interests of contentment and goodwill amongst all classes in the postal service, he will take steps to secure a cessation of such treatment.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have no reason to think that the post office staff at Dublin is treated differently from the staff at other offices, or that the present treatment is different from that accorded in the past. The annual increments of certain officers at Dublin were recently withheld because they had committed serious irregularities, precluding the grant of the necessary certificate of a year's approved service. The particular officer who appears to be referred to is one of these. He was not fined, but in view of his record his increment of 2s. a week could not be allowed in ordinary course. He appealed to me, and I personally considered his appeal, and confirmed the decision.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): I hope very shortly.

Colonies and the Tariffs.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any foreign country that gives as favourable treatment to British self-governing Colonies in the matter of tariffs as is given by the United Kingdom; and, if so, what is that country.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I presume that my hon. friend in asking this question is adopting the not unusual course of expressing by a question what is really his own opinion. I am not aware of any country which, on the whole, gives as favourable treatment to our self-governing Colonies as this country.

Defence of the Colonies.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the obligation of this country to defend the self-governing Colonies has ever been in any way defined by agreement or otherwise; and what is the reciprocal obligation which the Colonies have undertaken for the defence of the United Kingdom.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The obligation upon this country to defend the whole Empire is independent of any written agreement or treaty. No obligation on the part of the Colonies to participate in the defence of the United Kingdom has been made the subject of definition or of formal agreement. Judging from past experience, however, there seems to be no doubt that the Colonies recognise the obligations to assist in the defence of the Empire as a whole.

Assistant Clerks.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will state when the Parliamentary Committee to inquire into the case of Assistant Clerks (new class), for which a petition signed by a majority of the Members of this House was presented to him on the 25th ultimo, will be appointed.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The pay and conditions of service of the Assistant Clerks have repeatedly received careful consideration in the last few years, and I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by referring the subject to a Parliamentary Committee.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with an Amendment.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 125.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 125.]

Bill as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday, 1st July.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

George Smith Clark, esquire, for the Borough of Belfast (North Belfast Division.)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES AND CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the three Standing Committees for the consideration of all Public Bills not relating exclusively to Scotland, which may be committed to a Standing Committee.

Standing Committee A.

Mr. Adkins, Mr. Arthur Allen, Sir William Anson, Mr. Arkwright, Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Baker, Mr. Godfrey Baring, Mr. Beckett, Sir John Bethell, Mr. Boland, Mr. Cave, Sir Frederick Cawley, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Chance, Mr. Cobbold, Sir William Collins, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. David Davies, Mr. Ellis Davies, Mr. Timothy Davies, Mr. Devlin, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Sir William Foster, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. Secretary Gladstone, Mr. Glover, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Gwynne, Mr. Harrison-Broadley, Mr. Alexander Harvey, Mr. William Edwin Harvey, Captain Hervey, Mr. Hodge, Mr. William Hope, Sir John Jardine, Lord John Joicey-Cecil, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Lambton, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. McKillop, Mr. Mansfield, Sir Henry Norman, Mr. Nussey, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Parkes, Mr. Partington, Dr. Pollard, Mr. Thomas Richards, Mr. Rickett Mr. Charles Roberts, Mr. Rothschild, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr.

Herbert Samuel, Mr. Seaverns, Major Seeley, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Smyth, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. Theodore Taylor, Mr. Waldron, Mr. Walrond, Mr. John Ward, and Mr. Cathcart Wason.

Standing Committee B.

Sir John Baker, Captain Balfour, Mr. Barnard, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Bright, Mr. Burns, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Byles, Viscount Castlereagh, Lord Robert Cecil, Sir Francis Channing, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Clynes, Major Coates, Mr. Cochrane, Dr. Cooper, Sir Edwin Cornwall, Sir Henry Cotton, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Vaughan Davies, Mr. Evans, Mr. Ferens, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Haddock, Mr. George Hardy, Mr. Harwood, Mr. James Haslam, Mr. Hazleton, Colonel Ivor Herbert, Mr. Higham, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Hutton, Mr. William Jones, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kettle, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Lane-Fox, Sir Joseph Leese, Sir Francis Lowe, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Massie, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Mond, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Murray, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Parker, Mr. Paulton, Sir Francis Powell, Mr. Charles Price, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Richardson, Mr. John Robertson, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Soares, Mr. Austin Taylor, Mr. David Alfred Thomas, Mr. Walton, Mr. Walsh, Sir Thomas Whittaker, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Wyndham, and Mr. Yoxall.

Standing Committee C.

Mr. William Abraham (Cork), Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Alden, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Barran, Sir John Benn, Mr. Billson, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Brace, Mr. Bramsdon, Mr. Carlile, Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Herbert Craig, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Cross, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Dickinson, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Dolan, Sir George Doughty, Mr. Duckworth, Mr. Charles Duncan, Mr. James Duncan, Mr. Clement Edwards, Mr. Everett, Mr. Denison Faber, Mr. Findlay, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Hart-Davies, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Healy, Mr. Idris, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Lehmann, Mr. Lloyd-George, Colonel Charles Long, Mr. Walter Long, Sir Philip Magnus, Major McMicking, Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh, Viscount Morpeth, Mr. Napier, Mr. Paul, Earl Percy, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. William Priestley, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Rees, Mr. George Henry Roberts, Sir George Scott Robertson, Mr. Abel Smith, Mr. Soames, Sir Albert Spicer, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Verney, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Vivian, Mr. Walker, Mr. Warner, Mr. George White, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Osmond Williams, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, and Mr. Young.

Sir Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee that they had nominated Committee A as the Committee on which Government Bills shall not have precedence.

Sir Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee that they had selected the following eight Members to be the Chairmen's Panel, and to serve as Chairmen of the Four Standing Committees to be appointed under Standing Order No. 47:—Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Sir William Holland, Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Mr. John William Wilson.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Army (Annual) Bill, without Amendment.

NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) in moving for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the early notification of births, said that he had taken the unusual course of asking leave under the ten minutes rule, because of the very great gravity of the evil with which the Bill, however imperfectly and however modestly, attempted to deal. At the present moment 120,000 infants under one year of age died in this country every year, and it was no exaggeration to say that of these 60,000 might be saved if proper measures were taken. Such a state of things required the very earnest consideration of the House, for it amounted to this, that out of every 1,000 children born in this country 145 died without reaching the age of one year; and there were particular localities in which as many as 250, 300, or even 400 out of every 1,000 born died at that early age. It was no exaggeration to say that half of them might be saved; for the rate in some of our Colonies was no higher than seventy per 1,000, and in some of our own counties it was not higher than eighty-four. The seriousness of the question was not diminished by the fact that while the general death-rate in this country had been much diminished as the result of sanitary measures, the infantile death rate remained practically stationary. That he attributed mainly to two causes—neglect by mothers of their own health before the birth of their children, and neglect of the children's health immediately after they were born. He did not suggest for a moment that the neglect was due to wickedness or even to carelessness exactly, but it was in most cases due to ignorance, which was a far more potent cause of infantile mortality than the more commonly assigned causes of parental poverty and intemperance. Something could be done to remedy this state of affairs by the provision of skilled assistance to mothers in the early days of motherhood, and many health societies throughout the country had charged themselves with this duty. Remarkable results had been achieved in Huddersfield from the creditable efforts of the ex-mayor. But under the existing registration law six weeks might elapse before registration, and one-third of the children dying in the first year of life died in the first six weeks; so that these children were dead before the societies to which he referred could know that they had been born. It was solely with a view to remedy this defect that he had been asked to introduce this Bill. It provided that within forty-eight hours of the birth of every child a notification of that birth should be given to the medical officer of health. Notification was to be made in the simplest way, it being specially provided that it might be made by post card, and the duty of notifying a birth was thrown, in the first place, on the father of the child and, failing him, on any one who had been in attendance on the mother. The Bill further required that notification of children stillborn should be made as well as of those born alive. He urged the House to consider the seriousness of the evil the Bill was designed, he would not say to cure, but in some degree to mitigate. This was a non-Party question, and he ventured to hope that the Bill would be regarded as absolutely non-contentious. It was supported by hon Members in all quarters of the House, and he hoped its promoters would have the sympathetic support of the Government, and that the measure might be passed into law before the close of the present session.

Motion made, and Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the early Notification of Births,"—(*Lord R. Cecil*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Verney, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Sherwell, and Mr. Tennant.

NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS BILL.

"To provide for the early Notification of Births," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 169.]

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that on a previous occasion he indicated that the scheme of the Secretary of State for War had been received with favour in his constituency, and particularly that portion of it which referred to the Volunteers and the Territorial Army. But since then the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had referred to the provisions of the Bill as affecting India, and had argued that a striking force of 167,000 men was larger than was needed, seeing that we were now on good terms with Russia, whose armies, moreover, could not quickly get into India, so that in case of difficulty there would be ample time to make any arrangements that might be required for the protection of our Eastern Empire. With all due respect for the great authority of the right hon. Gentleman, he submitted that the views expressed by him were not those entertained by military experts connected with India. The voice of the right hon. Gentleman, as that of one who was, in respect of every attribute but age, an old Parliamentary hand was no doubt entitled to much weight, but so also were the views of those who spoke with great knowledge of India, and surely what was sauce for the old Parliamentarian should be sauce for the old soldier. Each in his own field was entitled to equal weight and consideration. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to look forward also with equanimity or satisfaction, to a diminution of this force of 167,000, but he submitted that in the absence of any provision for expanding it for six months after a war had broken out it was highly inexpedient that there should be any such reduction. The right hon. Gentleman had rightly said that the basis of the numerical strength of the force was the number of units actually existing at home to find drafts for India, and he had referred to the danger that existed lest the cost of the Army should lead to insistent demands for the reduction of the Navy. But he remembered that on a preceding occasion the right hon. Gentleman supported a proposal for a reduction of the Navy, and in view of that he hoped that his authority would not be given in support of reducing the striking force provided for by this scheme—a force which would not be at all too large for the next few years. The fact was that the Army at home chiefly existed for the purpose of finding drafts for India, and anyone who had not seen the Army in India had never seen the British Army. The one was the substance, the other the shadow. There was one other matter to be considered in connection with the question of reduction, and that was the effect upon the people of India themselves and throughout the East. That was very well illustrated by a recent incident. A cordon of police was placed in one of the best educated districts in India for plague purposes, and it was immediately reported among the natives that British rule had ceased to exist south of the cordon, which was designed to prevent the spread northwards of news of the catastrophe, while actually in one village the watchman went round proclaiming that a new reign had begun and that the possession of the country had changed hands. Absurd as the story was, it proved how a reduction of our Army might be viewed by the natives. We were, therefore, bound to have regard to the potential as well as the actual result of any such dealings with the British Army. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division had several times argued that the Cardwellian system was not suited to our requirements, but at any rate it had sufficed up to the present to keep up the supply of white troops up to the standard which was declared to be necessary immediately after the Mutiny, and had been found necessary up to the present moment. We wanted not so much great masses of troops in India, but it was requisite that they should possess staying power and power of expansion. If the House should feel that it was keeping up for the sake of India a force larger than was needed for English wants, and involving a burden greater than the taxpayer should be called upon to bear, he would beg hon. Members to remember what were the functions of the force, what it did in the South African War (when it saved Natal), and what it had done in China, Abyssinia, Tibet, Egypt, and Afghanistan. When they got down to the number of sabres, bayonets, and guns in the expeditionary force, deducting the non-combatants, it seemed after all to be very moderate in size. But the right hon. Baronet appeared to argue that this force involved enormous expenditure, and that this expense was annually growing in India. But there had, however, been a decrease of half a million in the Estimates, despite the extra outlay on quick-firing guns and officers, and the increase in the forces in India in the last few years was by no means commensurate with the increase in the area of the Empire and the increase in its population. In his opinion European troops could not be reduced in India, for we had potential enemies on frontiers now almost, including Persia, Beluchistan, and Mesopotamia, against whom provision must be made. Our Army in India was now based on the standard decided on at the close of the Mutiny; no regard had since been had to the increase of territory and population, and he would view with great anxiety any change which tended to reduce that standard. The Army in India ought not to suffer from experiments made at home, and he was glad to hear that, during the next year, there was to be no alteration either in system or in numbers in India. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had said he wanted a democratic Army. Might he substitute the word "national" for "democratic?"

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I protest. The hon. Member is putting certain statements into my mouth and I cannot recognise any of them. When I was alluding to the Indian Army and the striking force I quoted a statement by the Leader of the Opposition in which the inapplicability of the force to India was pointed out. Again, I made no demand for a democratic Army, but I pointed out that the Secretary of State had used that term and I said I could not find it in the scheme for officering the Army.

*MR. REES said he had evidently misunderstood *The Times* report, but he had had the advantage also of hearing his hon. friend. He stuck to his point that this force was not too great for the calls which might be made upon it. He thought it a very distressing thing to try and introduce into this subject the question of democracy. They must remember that when war broke out every class sent its sons into the field, and in this connection he would like to quote some words by Colonel à Court Repington, who said—

> "The regular Army must retain its present place if England is governed by sane men. We must resist to the last all further attempts to reduce the regular Army at home or abroad, because it is indispensable for foreign garrisons' reliefs and drafts, and a second line Army can only supplement it and can never supplant it."

Under the Government of Mr. Gladstone, when Mr. Cardwell was War Minister, seventy-one battalions were maintained at home in order to keep up the Indian Army, and that was at a period when the Empire was neither so rich, so extensive, nor so populous as now. How then was it possible now to justify any reduction? The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division had given a general support to the arguments of the right hon. Baronet, and if he understood him rightly he had argued that in six weeks we could under our present system of fourteen days annual training—one half of which depended on the good will of employers—get an Army as good as that of the Swiss which was based on sixty-five days compulsory training every year, and was moreover a conscript army.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): If the hon. Member will forgive me I should like to say that he is misrepresenting me, unintentionally no doubt. What I said was that the Army proposed by the right hon. Gentleman would with six weeks training subsequent to mobilisation be as good as the Swiss Army.

*MR. REES said he could not even agree with that. He had consulted a good many soldiers on the point, and all experts disagreed with the view of the hon. and gallant Member.

MAJOR SEELY: It is simply a question of arithmetic.

*MR. REES said it was a military and not an arithmetical question, and depended on many factors other than arithmetic. Any attempt to represent the amateur as equal to the professional soldier and to disparage the value of and need for training was, he thought, disastrous. He must insist that with anything like our present periods of voluntary training the territorial forces of the future would necessarily need months to form and harden by training after war had broken out or after embodiment, and would not, therefore, be able to answer all the calls that might be made upon them. Further than that, the hon. and gallant Member had seemed to suggest the desirability of officers passing through the ranks as in Prussia, because he said it promoted an admirable feeling between officers and men.

*MAJOR SEELY: What I said was that if the Prussian Army was more democratic than ours it was because many officers in the Landwehr had first to serve in the ranks, whereas in our Army the number of promotions from the ranks was so small as to be a negligible quantity.

*MR. REES doubted if the system was worthy our adoption, and was amazed at the suggestion that the Prussian army was more democratic than our own. The expression in respect of an army seemed to him most inappropriate, and could, he thought, only connote the feeling to which he referred. Was the hon. and gallant Member not aware of certain figures regarding mortality in the Prussian Army? It was entirely wrong to suggest that British officers were not on good terms with their men, or that an anti-democratic feeling was rife in our Army.

MAJOR SEELY: I never did.

*MR. REES said the hon. and gallant Member suggested that the adoption of the foreign system, to wit, that of Prussia, would bring about an improvement in that respect.

MAJOR SEELY: No, no!

*MR. REES said he despaired in that case of getting at exactly what the hon. and gallant Member meant by his reference to Prussia by way of example, and would pass from that point to the Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Preston. That Amendment suggested that the Bill should not be proceeded with until we had ascertained what the Colonies would contribute to the national defence. He hoped that in view of the statement of the Prime Minister that day to the effect that the obligation of England to defend the whole Empire was undisputed the Amendment would not be moved. It would be a most unfortunate thing if that subject were raised in the House of Commons at the present moment, and he hoped the hon. Member would give up the bad habit of trying to settle everything by logic. These questions could not be settled on arithmetical or logical lines. He considered that the participation of the Colonies in any defence scheme should run on the line of each Colony defending itself, or rather perfecting its own defences, providing as far as possible its own troops, and relying on one great Navy at the centre of the Empire. He was delighted to have the concurrence of the hon. Member for Preston in that, but he would remind him of the fate of another logician, who was in the habit of proving the worse to be the better case. The Parliament of Athens sent Socrates a dose of hemlock, and he sincerely hoped the electors of Preston would not do the like for his hon. friend, whose courage he admired, and whose abilities he envied. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had objected to the Bill because it sought to introduce militarism into our schools, and he wished to state that in the City of London there was a boys' shooting club, which apparently was approved by the boys' fathers. The parents were all asked if they agreed to their boys taking part in it. Out of 100 parents ninety-nine agreed, and there was only one parent who objected. He rather wondered that even one man objected to his son's being brought up to become proficient in such exercises. Was it necessary to kill, because one could shoot, and who was so dangerous with gun in hand, as the man inexpert in its use? The hon. Member had also said that the high places in the Army were the monopoly of the rich and well to do; but in view of the case of Hector Macdonald it was absurd to say that there were not means by which a capable man could rise from the ranks. Every boy in a humble station could not by legislation be placed in a position occupied by others as a result perhaps of generations of industry, ability and self restraint. To say he could was the idle dream of the idle agitator. He maintained that under the present system there was a ladder up which all could climb step by step. He had seen it largely used in Wales where, in his own constituency, boys had mounted to the topmost rung, but not so much in England. In the English ladder an all-important "Intermediate" rung was wanting. Still, the ladder did exist, and it was quite possible for boys to rise to the highest positions, if they were deserving of them. Then it was said that the Bill of the Government would interfere with the industrial relations between employer and employed. He did not know how that could be, but he did know that the hon. Gentlemen who clamoured most for reductions in the Army and Navy were the first to object to the discharges of men at Woolwich Arsenal. They could not have it both ways, and besides, if relief was given in one constituency by providing State employment beyond the needs of the State and not in others, it must produce considerable disappointment and dissatisfaction amongst those who were far removed from the throne of grace, or had not such powerful Members as other constituencies had. He did not see that any constituency had a greater claim in this respect than another, and would oppose any benefits not extended to the Montgomery district. Moreover, he did not see the justification for the complaint that this Bill would interfere with industrial relations between employer and employed, because 60 to 86 per cent. of the soldiers were artisans, labourers, miners, and factory hands. Then the hon. Member had said that the Secretary of State for War's scheme would create a military spirit; but it was folly to suppose that a man who shot straight wanted to kill. On this point he would like to read a communication from President Roosevelt to the Senate. The President, who was the greatest living peacemaker, said—

> "Nothing would more promote iniquity, nothing would further defer the reign upon earth of peace and righteousness, than for the free and enlightened peoples, who strive towards justice, deliberately to render themselves powerless, while leaving every despotism and barbarism armed and able to work their wicked will. The chance for the settlement of disputes peacefully by arbitration now depends mainly upon the possession by the nations that mean to do right of sufficient armed strength to make their purpose effective."

Those were words with which he would associate himself in regard to the condemnation which had been uttered of this military training in schools. He would give the hon. Member another passage from a speech of that great lover of peace and composer of differences between the nations. President Roosevelt also said—

> "We should establish shooting galleries in all the large public and military schools, should maintain national target ranges in different parts of the country, and should in every way encourage the formation of rifle clubs throughout all parts of the land."

He was not in favour of conscription, nor were his constituents, but they did believe in training the people to be capable of defending themselves and their country, and while he was on the subject of rifle ranges he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not forget that there was a district which had supplied him with many brave soldiers in the past, and which would do so in the future, and which badly needed a rifle range—he meant the military centre at Welshpool. As to the financial aspect of the question, he thought the House should not lose any financial control it possessed over the money voted under the present system for Volunteers; but while he was keen on maintaining such control it did not follow that a system of red tape should be introduced which might strangle the new system and bring about friction. Volunteer accounts differed from those of the Army, and there should be some elasticity in regard to the auditing of such accounts. The county associations, too, would not like their accounts to be audited by the War Office officials, and this work should be done, if possible, by chartered accountants. These associations, he felt sure, not being very amenable to pressure from the War Office, would accept the criticisms of these public accountants in a good spirit, and the accountants being in the habit of working for the public would not be liable to Parliamentary or official pressure. He noticed that nearly every speech that had been made expressed doubt about the finance of the Territorial Army, and he wished to express a strong hope that the Secretary of State would lay a Memorandum giving figures showing how the scheme was to be financed. If that were done it would conduce to the better understanding of the subject, which hon. Members like himself were not able to make out without assistance. The Bill dealt with a subject which was too serious to be left to experts alone, and no Member could divest himself of personal responsibility. His own responsibility was great, as he represented a district which had provided many good soldiers to the Line and to the Auxiliary Forces, and would, he hoped, continue to discharge that valuable function.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said that up till now much time had been occupied in listening to the opinion of experts, and in the main it seemed that one high expert had spent his time in flatly contradicting the statement made by the high expert who preceded him. This was the third Army scheme which the House of Commons had had to consider in recent years, and every Minister responsible for the schemes that had gone before had, he believed, one after another, informed the House that he was introducing his scheme with the full concurrence and support of his expert advisers at the War Office. In some ways, therefore, it was exceedingly embarrassing for amateurs like the Labour Members to make up their mind as to how they were going to vote. It was perfectly true, as the hon. Member who had just addressed the House had said, that the question of Army organisation was not altogether a question for experts; but he thought they would feel a little more comfortable in their minds if the experts who professed to know more about these questions and how an army ought to be constructed, would kindly through the life of one Ministry, and also, he might venture to suggest when one Ministry gave place to another, show some consistent point of view, and produce a scheme which, although it might vary in details, was nevertheless constructed upon the same fundamental idea as that which had preceded it. He had done his best to follow this question, more especially as the illness of his hon. friend the Member for Merthyr prevented him from being there to speak on behalf of the Party; but in his (Mr. Macdonald's) search for knowledge and consistency he found himself in the position of Japhet when he commenced his search for his father. The opinions were conflicting and contradictory, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, if he read his speech aright, suggested that even the figures presented from actuarial sources recently in connection with the scheme were open to very grave suspicion in regard to their accuracy. All he could say by way of consolation was that that might give a glint of hope to those who wanted a further reduction of armaments—that when they saw a Labour Party in power it could go to the War Office and be able to produce a scheme dividing the Army by half, and their War Minister would be able to rise in his place on the Government bench and inform hon. Gentlemen opposite to him that his scheme for reduction of the Army to half and of the expenditure to one-third or one-fourth had been produced with the full concurrence of the experts at the War Office, in whose hands the military destinies of the country rested. There was only one thing of which he was perfectly certain, and that was that if ever the time came when a Government sitting on those benches was responsible for the production of a scheme for conscription, the military advisers at the War Office would honestly produce a scheme with which Ministers would agree, and before he sat down he was going to express the suspicion that the scheme before the House was perhaps the first stage towards that most undesirable end. He did not desire to take up the time of the House in offering expert criticisms. He was not competent to do so, but he did hope before the Second Reading of this Bill took place they might have some clear ideas conveyed to their minds on these matters. Up to the present they had not had any information of that kind and they were still in the dark. They had no guarantee that, if by any accident the present Ministry were to disappear and another Ministry were to make itself responsible for another Army scheme, within six months a totally different set of proposals would no be brought forward, and they would be asked to vote upon them. But without wasting words, he desired to say they associated themselves with the criticisms made by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean as to the size of Army that was needed. They were not at all convinced that it was necessary to increase the *personnel* of the Army at the present time, and he thought if the officials at the War Office had been pressed a little more they would have given evidence in favour of the doubt the Labour Members felt. Surely by this time every reasonable man must have come to the conclusion that the game of "beggar my neighbour," of adding battalion to battalion because some other country had done so, or some other country threatened to do so, was ridiculous, and that the time had come to try to meet the difficulty, not by an increase of armaments, but by a diplomatic understanding as to the strength of those armaments. The Party to which he belonged was an international Parliamentary Party, charged with the task of helping to a solution this great question in every Parliament in Europe, and the Labour and Socialist Party would be betraying itself if the Labour Members allowed a Bill increasing the *personnel* of the Army to go through the British House of Commons without making a protest by voting against the Second Reading of the Bill. They were not in favour of "a nation in arms." It was a grandiloquent expression and looked patriotic. One had to disclaim that expression because so many people were of opinion that unless one was in favour of "a nation in arms" he was not a patriot nor a lover of his country, and did not appreciate the great traditional and spiritual inheritance that the past had given to him. He denied the accusation, which was false, because those who declined to echo that cry did so for the reason that they were convinced, by a study of the history of European countries and of contemporary politics at home and abroad, that it was not going to solve one problem that faced us as a power in the world and was not going to help us to keep the flag of the country high or to keep it clean as they desired to do. He wished to offer some criticisms on the Bill, not as a military expert, but as one who was interested in the civil politics of the country. The problem of the Army was even a greater civil problem than a military one. It was one which interested every Member of the House, even though they had not the honour of being, as he had not, an officer in the Yeomanry or Militia. The first objection which the Labour Party took to the Bill was that it virtually destroyed the civil character of the Volunteer Force. They were quite willing to admit that the Volunteers might to a large extent be open to the charge of having played at soldiering. He did not resist arguments pointing out that in its present condition the Volunteer Force was not a Force upon which we could rely in the case of invasion. They were perfectly prepared to support any proposal for improving the character and efficiency of the Volunteer Force. But that force could very properly make this claim—that it had never been appreciated by the War Office—never had a chance of showing what it could do as a Civil Force. The War Secretary sought to increase the military character of the Volunteer Force. From a legal point of view little or no change was to take place, but from a human point of view a revolution was to happen by the *status* of the Volunteer as defined in the Bill. The Force was now confronted by some serious obstacles which went to erect a very formidable barrier against its popularity. From inquiries he had made he did not believe the right hon. Gentleman would find that response to Volunteer recruiting which was necessary fto carry his scheme into successful operation. He hoped he was wrong in that belief, because the effect, if he was right, would be so serious that he would much rather find that his view was wrong. If this new scheme broke down there would be no bulwark against conscription. The right hon. Gentleman was like a gamester who played for very high stakes, but unlike a Scotsman, who left himself three or four chances of retrieving his first bad fortune. If the right hon. Gentleman lost he was done for, because it was absolutely impossible for him to hope to retrieve and reconstruct the Volunteer Home Defence Force on lines more free and easy and more liberal than those he had laid down in this Bill. He was like a general who was so confident that he could win a battle that he cut himself off from his base of supply. If he won it was all right, but if he lost he was annihilated, and the enemy chewed him up. As he had said, if the right hon. Gentleman's scheme broke down and the Volunteers did not enlist there was nothing between the country and conscription, and he had handed himself over to the National Service League and its propaganda. The Labour Party held a very strong objection to the county associations. They would be a union of influences mainly political and social. The county associations would change the political and social centre of gravity in our counties. He thought the right hon. Gentleman suggested that the appointment of Justices of the Peace, and some petty honours, knighthoods, and so forth, should be given to gentlemen who showed themselves active in regard to these associations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington) said he referred to Deputy-Lieutenants.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that if it was confined to Deputy-Lieutenants he could not make the point he was going to make. He had misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman, and he would not pursue it. They were to have the county associations, which would be necessarily political and social, and which, when they were in full working order, would become a new nucleus of political and social influence. He was bound to say that he could not see why the right hon. Gentleman did that. From the point of view of a democratic Government, he did not see why the right hon. Gentleman should not keep his weather eye open, and suspect the operation of those organisations. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to recreate a form of militarism which did not now correspond to the industrial condition of the country; he wanted to face a modern problem with a mediæval idea in his mind. No Member of the House was more qualified than the right hon. Gentleman to see how very absurd that proposal was. Modern problems must be faced by modern methods; and the industrial basis which should be taken by the right hon. Gentleman, whatever machinery he cared to create, must be an industrial basis corresponding to existing facts, and not a basis which assumed the old-fashioned relationship between the hall and the village. He was really rather surprised, when the right hon. Gentleman was delivering his speech on the introduction of the Bill, to hear him talk of the country gentleman's relation to the village. He dealt in that speech with an idea which had gone; whether they liked it or not, they could not bring it back. His colleague the Chancellor of the Exchequer had knocked another nail into the coffin of that state of things last Thursday, in introducing his Budget, and he hoped that more nails would be knocked into that coffin before this Parliament ended. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War could not indeed draw on that dead organisation, or upon a state of things which had been condemned, and would be condemned so far as it had any vitality in it; he could not trust to that as a basis on which to place the most important part of the mechanism which he brought into existence by his Bill. It ought to be modified. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take into consideration the appeal made by his hon. friend the Member for Edinburgh, who desired some sort of assurance that the county associations, at all events as at present proposed, might not be regarded as an essential part of the Bill. Then they came to the question of the officers. An interim Report had been presented the other day on the supply of officers, and he thought they had received a warning of what was going to happen. When they saw a proposal made, an exceedingly curious proposal, that officers were to be created at the London School of Economics, he thought they must have been rather more amused than edified by it. If *Punch* had made the suggestion, it would have been laughed at, because it was laughable. The fact of the matter was, they were getting a little bit lax in their method of discovering ability. The method they were adopting now was that any man who passed any examination apparently was able to do anything. It was really about time, in a democratic Parliament at any rate, that they showed some discrimination in that respect. He was not going to deal with the appointment of officers in the Regular Army; it did not arise that day; but if the system was bad for the Regular Army, as he thought it was, it was ten times worse for the Home Defence Force. The whole idea of the Home Defence Force was the hearth and home idea. They had never used their opportunities in giving the Volunteer Forces some interesting work to do. Every corner of the country was full of problems of defence; every little wood, every little ditch, every tree, every irregularity of the ground, presented exceedingly interesting problems for an officer who knew how to handle his men, and how to occupy them with work which would be really interesting for them to do. They had been told that this was just beginning. What he would suggest to his right hon. friend was that if he wanted a test for officers—and of course there must be a test—why not create a class for officers on the spot? Why not take a leaf out of the book of our late enemies in South Africa? Why not give the ordinary farm labourer a chance of showing what he could do as a tactician? Let them put a man down twenty miles away from his home, on a dark nigh and tell him to identify the objects so far as he could see them. Let them give him the problem of bringing in twenty men to his own house, on the assumption that an enemy was following up behind him, and, if he did it, then make him an officer. What did it benefit that a man had been to Eton or Harrow, or that he went to a middle-class school? The only test imposed by a middle-class school was that the man's father had plenty of money to pay for his education. Surely the dead hand was not going to lie heavily on His Majesty's Government—His Majesty's present Government at any rate. These were the lines to go upon instead of those of the interim Report which was simply crammed full of social prejudices. Let them strike out some other method and select their officers as the Boers selected theirs. He had seen Boer officers living in the humblest huts, and whose wives and daughters served at table—men who had added chapters to the history of South Africa that would never tarnish. These men had not been sent to universities, and they were all the better for having been kept from secondary schools. If the Home Territorial Force was to be built up on the ideas of this interim Report, and on certain clauses of the Bill, they were going to have a force for show, and not for fighting. The Labour Party wanted a force for fighting, and not for show. Their next objection was to the cadet corps. What happened was this. A youngster, a boy, a child, joined the cadet corps. They taught him certain drill, certain arts of war, and when the time came that he had to leave the cadet corps, he was sick of the whole business, and he did not join the Volunteers or the Regular Army. From the military point of view he thought that was a great danger. If they were going to depend on keen intellectual interest in this business, if they were going to create a hearth and home defence force, then let them not sicken the population too soon. Youths, after they had left the cadet corps, would consider that they had done their part, and were not called upon to enlist as adults either into a striking or into a defence force. If they followed the mind of a child who went into the cadet corps they would find that it was influenced very largely by tinsel considerations. The problem was an exceedingly simple one for it; it believed in force; candidly and honestly the child believed in force. It believed in the force of the Empire, and it was at its early age and development incapacitated from remembering the power of diplomacy, the power of peaceful means, in piloting a country successfully through dangerous situations. So, if the cadet corps was bad for military purposes and for the true military spirit, it also poisoned the springs of politics at the very source. He ventured to suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that when they got into Committee he should remove this clause which made the cadet corps essentially a part of the Home Army. His final point was the relation set up by the Bill with the workshop. He thought that for the first time in the history of Volunteers, the uniform was to appear in the workshop. He thought the men in workshops would resist it. The right hon. Gentleman believed that the employers would meet him and give him facilities in order that the Volunteers might be adequately trained. He did not believe it. The condition which this Bill sought to impose was worse than conscription so far as industry was concerned. Under conscription we would have say 1,000,000 men always out of the labour market.

But those in it were steadily in it. The employer could, therefore, gauge the producing force of his workshop. But suppose they told employers that a number of their workmen were required to be taken out for ten days or a fortnight's training; such a proceeding would paralyse industry. The workshop could not go on, and especially where labour was subdivided minutely. Where a man worked through the whole process the difficulty would not be great. Let them take a boot and shoe factory, where scores of men worked apart from each other, but completing each other's work, ask the employer to allow 100 of these men to go out for ten days at a time. It would be better to close the factory doors and have a holiday during the whole period of training, because, as a matter of fact, it would pay better to do that, considering the manner in which the industry was organised. In these circumstances, an employer would be likely to object, and refuse to allow his employees to join the Territorial Force. Some employers might make it a condition of employment that a man should be a member of the Territorial Force whilst other employers would debar every such man from work under them. It was impossible for the Labour Members to move the Amendment which they had on the Paper, but they still held to it. In their opinion, the Bill sought to introduce militarism into public schools. They objected to that. It sought to make the training of officers for positions in the Army practically the monopoly of the rich and well-to-do classes. They objected to that. It sought to interfere with the relations between employer and employed—he agreed with what others had said on that point—and it gave preferential treatment to men who had been soldiers. They objected to that; and they could not possibly vote for the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): Although there are many points on which I find myself in disagreement with the hon. Member who has just spoken, I am quite sure I am in agreement with everybody who heard him when I say that the House has listened with admiration to the exposition he has made on behalf of those with whom he is associated. We listened to him with unqualified admiration, though some of the views he expressed were, I might say, almost offensive; but seldom have they been put in so agreeable and attractive a form by the representatives of hon. Members below the Gangway as they have been by the hon. Gentleman to-day. I listened to one remark of his with some alarm, when he described the condition of the landed interest and the total disappearance of the relations between the landowners and those among whom they live. I am not prepared to admit the complete accuracy of his description. He told us that a blow had been struck at them, the other day, in the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that he hoped other blows would follow. I listened to the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer very closely from beginning to end, and I confess that I did not discover that it contained this attack upon the unfortunate class to which I have the honour to belong. I do not think the hon. Gentleman himself, though he may be inclined occasionally to paint our sins in deeper colours than I think are quite justifiable, will forget that we belong to that class which pays the increased death duties under the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme. I do not think the hon. Gentleman is right when he says that in the greater part of the country districts there does not exist to-day those old and friendly relations between the squire and his neighbours that have led to their jointly taking part in local work and in national defence; I believe that they do exist, though in an altered form, yet in a very strong degree, and that in the future, as in the past, they will lead them to do their best in regard to any well-considered scheme that may be adopted. It has been suggested in one or to speeches in the course of the debate, and also outside the House, that some, at all events, of the criticisms which have been addressed to the scheme of the Secretary of State from this side of the House had their foundation in Party feeling. If any idea of that sort exists, speaking for myself and also on behalf of those for whom I think I am entitled to speak, I may say that no Party feeling whatever has entered into any of the criticisms which we have passed. There are many reasons, but I will give two. In the first place there is a desire, almost a passionate desire, amongst those on this side of the House who have taken an interest in the problem of national defence, and realised its difficulties, to see the question raised above the level of Party politics, and to seek and find some scheme which might be regarded as offering at all events some working foundation on which might be placed eventually a really efficient and complete system of national defence. For that reason alone, therefore, there is no Party feeling in any criticisms which we offer. The second reason is that it is largely felt by many of us that the Secretary of State has given an immense amount of labour and trouble to the development of this scheme, a circumstance which should make it impossible for us to attack him as a Party opponent, however necessary we may think it to offer criticisms after a careful examination of his proposals. Therefore, I hope there will be no suggestion that in our criticisms we are actuated by other than a sincere desire to see that we get a scheme which is likely to last and to be effective. So far we know little of what the scheme of the Secretary of State is going to do. He can know but little himself, because it must be decided, as other schemes have been, by experience of its working. A great part of the work done by the Secretary of State under his proposals is of a destructive character in connection with our existing Army, and I do not at all share the view of the hon. Member for Leicester that that work of destruction has been inefficient. The reduction which the right hon. Gentleman has thought necessary is such as, I think, must have a bad effect upon the future of our Army, when regiments which have a part in our history find that their existence has come to an end. Take a regiment like the Northumberland Fusiliers, or the Warwick Regiment, whose history has been magnificent, whose record has certainly never been exceeded, and who assuredly might have looked forward to retaining to the end their place in the list of the Army. They are gone as part of the scheme of reduction. I am not going to say more than one word about that part of the scheme, not because I do not take great interest in it, but because I am anxious to say something about the territorial branch, or auxiliary branch, as it has been called, and do not wish to take up more time than is absolutely necessary. I confess that one of the great difficulties in the way of providing a sufficient army hitherto has been to find enough of both officers and men. With the inevitable surroundings of Army life, I cannot see what there is in the scheme of the Secretary of State to improve that position of things, or to give us either more officers or more men. As the immediate result of the reductions which have already been made, there will be in Aldershot, in the course of the next few weeks, fifty or sixty officers unattached, who have lost the regiments to which they belonged, and who are now wondering what will be their fate in the future. Is it likely that this will encourage other men to join the Army? Is it likely that it will lead to a larger provision of officers than we have had hitherto? It seems to me that there is every indication that this part of the scheme will be a deterrent rather than an encouragement. For that reason I say that the greater portion of the work that the right hon. Gentleman has done so far is rather destructive than constructive. Coming to the constructive part, the great Territorial Army scheme, I disagree with much that the hon. Member for Leicester said, but I think the Secretary of State must have listened not merely with interest, but with grave interest to his description of what, from his point of view, will be the inevitable result of this new system of dealing with the great Volunteer Force of the country The idea of the Secretary of State is to produce, instead of a Volunteer Army, a Territorial Army, in which are to be merged the present Militia, Imperial Yeomanry, and Volunteers. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, when he was speaking the other day, said that the real difference between the two Parties on this question was that the Government proposed to establish their Force upon two lines, whereas our policy was to establish it upon three lines. I have no objection to that description of the difference, because I believe it to be fairly accurate, and I believe myself that the three-line system is the one to which you will have ultimately to have recourse, whatever method you adopt for the organisation of the Territorial Army; because you have to deal with three totally distinct and different kinds of men and officers. I put on one side the Regular Army, the professional soldier, whether officer or man. Whether the Militia be an effective Force or not with its present position, you have in that Force and in the Yeomanry and Volunteers two classes who are totally different in every respect, and I do not believe that you will be able, certainly not by mere appeals to patriotism, to weld those two totally different classes into one single Force. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs told us that the reason for this two-line as opposed to a three-line system was to be found in economy of administration; he said it was likely to be more successful and more economical. He did not tell us in what way it was going to prove more economical, and there are already significant signs that many of the anticipated economies in connection with the organisation of the Force will have to be abandoned. We shall hear, when the Secretary of State speaks presently, what his decision is upon this matter, as no indication has been given of how these great economies are to be effected by adopting a two-line instead of a three-line system. The case I desire chiefly to put to-day is that of the Imperial Yeomanry, but before I go into that I desire to ask the Secretary of State a question which he may be good enough to answer when he speaks this evening. As he will remember, he left the position of the Irish Militia regiments and of the Irish Imperial Yeomanry regiments, the North of Ireland and South of Ireland Yeomanry, rather vaguely described in his original speech. It may be our fault, but at all events there does exist some doubt as to the effect of the scheme on the Irish Militia and these two Yeomanry regiments, and it would be a very great kindness to the officers and men connected with those regiments if the right hon. Gentleman would tell us what the precise effect of the scheme will be so far as they are concerned. What is it that it is proposed to do with the Imperial Yeomanry? I have listened to a great many speeches from the other side of the House in regard to the system instituted when we were in office, and upon the policy and action of Mr. Brodrick and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon. Whatever may have been their shortcomings in regard to the Army, I can safely say, speaking from my own experience of the Yeomanry, that those two right hon. Gentlemen did wonders for that force, that they put it altogether on a new footing, and that the Yeomanry responded, I think, admirably and honourably to the calls made upon them. What are the Government going to do? They are going, in this new territorial scheme, entirely to remodel and alter the constitution of that force. The hon. Member for Leicester warned the Secretary of State that he has put all his money on one horse, and asked what he would do if that proposal broke down and he was left without the new Territorial Army. He suggested that you are going to get men on terms very different in all respects from those under which they are enlisted at the present time. The Secretary of State has laid stress—and I think rightly—upon the necessity for sufficient training and the making of the men of this force thoroughly efficient. I do not think you can exaggerate the importance of the extra training which they are to get, and I am sure they will respond to any demand you make upon them in order to become thoroughly efficient; but there are certain conditions which, if imposed, will make it impossible for these men to join. It is sometimes said that the condition of foreign service would be very distasteful to the men. I do not myself believe that. I do not believe that if you decide to impose on these men upon joining the Volunteer Forces conditions as to service abroad in time of national stress and peril you would prevent one recruit in 500 from joining. It will be necessary to give to the men in sufficient numbers the training which they require to make them efficient. I am convinced that the experience in the future will be the same as that in the past. In the case of war these men would join for service abroad in the largest possible numbers. When the Imperial Yeomanry were called upon to find recruits in 1899 and 1900 the conditions were different. They had their wives and families and other dependents to support and it was impossible for them to leave. Many of them were farmers or tradesmen, and at any rate their conditions were such that they could not leave. But the immediate result of the reforms introduced by my two right hon. friends was to alter the character of the men who joined the Imperial Yeomanry. It was made possible for men to join because they were no longer called upon to pay considerable sums out of their own pockets. But if you require these men to pay their expenses out of their pay and allowances, if they are to be reduced to the position of ordinary soldiers on the outbreak of war, if they are to be liable for service abroad, not going in squadrons or companies of their own regiments, but in order to reinforce the Army at the front, if they are to be taken into camp for six months, I am convinced that the great majority of the men will regard these as impossible conditions and refuse to undertake a liability far more serious than they should accept. Presumably—and I believe it is the case—you get a better class of men to join these Auxiliary Forces under other conditions. I remember discussing with four or five Volunteer officers who were extremely well aware of the feeling in their battalions whether or not there should be some system of compulsory service for the Auxiliary Forces alone. They were opposed to it. They said "We get as a rule the best men in the class that provides recruits to the Volunteer Force, but the moment you make it compulsory you will have a great many men of an inferior class who will come in because they are compelled, and you will be better without them." I believe that is the view of the men themselves who join the Auxiliary Forces. They come in now because they are the very best class of men in their respective trades. I do not care whether he is a farmer, a small tradesman, a carpenter, a blacksmith, or whatever he may be, what are you going to do in regard to this condition of prolonged training in camp? The best man will have his work doubled or trebled when war breaks out, when every sort of supply is called for to double or treble the usual extent. He is the man who would be earning much higher wages than in ordinary peace time. He is to be penalised by being brought into camp, while the man who is his inferior, not only as a soldier but as a workman, is to be given an opportunity of getting increased earnings. I believe that condition will militate very seriously against your getting the necessary number of men. Now I come to the question of pay and allowances. We have heard a great deal in this debate about patriotism. We have been told that if an appeal were properly made to the patriotism of the men of the Reserve Forces they would come. Patriotism is all very well, but a man has to think of his wife and children and other dependents before he volunteers. He is engaged in civil life in a trade or other occupation, and he must think not only of what his earnings are, but of what his expenses are going to be. The old Yeoman was obliged to pay out of his pocket towards the cost of his training. Under the present system he does not do so. The pay, and the allowance given for forage for his horse, enables him not only to pay his expenses, but in some cases, if the management of the regiment is prudent, to go away with a small amount in his pocket. You are going to change all that. You are asking a man to accept the conditions of the Regular soldier. I venture to say that you are making a demand upon him which is altogether unreasonable, and which he cannot meet. Not only has he to make himself as efficient as he can in fourteen or eighteen days training in ordinary years, but, if war breaks out, he has, in addition, to live the life of an ordinary soldier in respect of his camp food, messing, etc. If you draw a comparison between the Regular soldier and the Volunteer, say, in the case of a regiment of cavalry and a Yeomanry regiment, you can realise the difference. In the case of the Regular regiment the manœuvres go on perhaps for two or three days when the soldier has hard work, and then there are two or three days off. But the Yeoman, if he is going to learn anything at all, must work every day at his training whether wet or dry, from early morning till late in the afternoon. At the present moment the first thing everybody connected with Volunteer regiments asks when he enlists is whether his work is to be that of a soldier or whether he has to do other duties which he does not care about. I do not believe that you can, in reason, make the standard of proficiency too high. But if you call upon men to discharge duties which are only discharged by soldiers in the Regular regiments, I do not believe that you will get them. I believe the numbers will fall off in a way that will startle you. Quite recently a meeting of commanding officers was held, and a series of resolutions were passed, all of which pointed in one direction. These men, after all, speak with personal experience of the work they have been engaged upon. They know what it is to get recruits. I will undertake to say that there is not a greater anxiety for a commanding officer in connection with a Volunteer regiment than the ascertaining each year whether he is going to get a sufficient number of recruits to keep his regiment up to the establishment. It has been extremely difficult in times past. I believe if the Secretary of State could see his way to leave the Imperial Yeomanry alone in the matter of pay and allowances, the force would continue to improve and increase in numbers as he desires that they should do. But if, on the other hand, you go in the teeth of the opinion, I believe, of the great majority of officers who have served in the force, and of the views held at this moment by the commanding officers and certainly by all those who were present at the meeting to which I have referred, you will only have yourselves to thank if the scheme breaks down. The figures as to the number of Yeomen and Volunteers who volunteered for service in the late war vary a little because there is great difficulty, as the House knows, in getting at them. But I believe that something like 70,000 offered to go and that over 30,000 went. I believe that if you give the men the necessary training and fit them to go abroad they will do in the future what they have done in the past. If you are going to impose these conditions which, I believe, are not necessary, you will get rid of the force. The Imperial Yeomanry have been more than once laughed at by some hon. Members who have spoken of them as men who did not work hard enough and who played at being soldiers. I regret that I am no longer on the active list, owing to age, but I make the suggestion on the part of my successor in command of my regiment, to those who think that the yeoman's life is one of play and amusement that they should get recruited in my regiment, and after three weeks' training they will come away strongly convinced that the yeoman's life is not one of play or ease. That kind of criticism comes from those who do not know what the Yeomanry has been doing during the last ten years. The hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs said that it would be unfortunate in the way of Army reform if a scheme were adopted which would lessen the willingness of men to join the Auxiliary Forces. The Yeomanry have been given the opportunity of improving, and they have improved. I sincerely hope that in the attempt to reconstitute the Auxiliary Forces nothing will be done to damp the enthusiasm of these men in their desire to render a service to their country. If the chance were given them they would still further improve. There are not very many of them, but more can be got. They are men of the right material and with right desires. The officers of the Yeomanry have altered as much as the men within the last ten years. I venture to say that their knowledge of their duties, their enthusiasm in their work and their attention to detail are as great as anyone could conceive; and it is to them a matter of profound apprehension that the War Office and this House appear not to recognise these facts, but to be willing to run risks in materially altering the constitution of the force. I make this appeal on their behalf because they are at present, in my opinion, a useful part of our Army of Defence, and they can be rendered still more useful and valuable in the future. I am satisfied that, if you persevere with the conditions laid down in the scheme of the Secretary for War, in a short time you will lose this force altogether. The right hon. Gentleman is engaged in a great task of reforming the whole of the Volunteer Army. He is seeking to make of the different forces composing it one great force. I will not discuss the Volunteer or the Militia aspect of the case. Everybody knows that it is necessary to make some changes in the Militia; and the Volunteers want assistance and guidance, but not changes of a serious character. But I ask why, because it is necessary to make changes in two of the forces, it is also necessary to make changes in the one which has improved and which at the present time is not open to criticism? If that view is correct I hope that the Secretary of State for War will see his way to stay his hand and leave the Imperial Yeomanry as they are, subject to this, that he can impose upon them as high a test of efficiency as can be demanded by the greatest military authorities. You cannot strain their loyalty by any demand of that kind. What we ask is, that the right hon. Gentleman will not impose upon them financial conditions which will make it impossible for men to join the corps as at present, and conditions in regard to training which we believe will be not only distasteful, but destructive.

Mr. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) said that he had served in the Volunteers, both in the ranks and as an officer, and both in peace and in war. The hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, had said that during the Easter recess he took pains to go among his constituents to ask their opinion in regard to this Bill, and he found that the Volunteers in his part of the country were more or less contented with it. He was of a different opinion. He had gone into the question locally and he found that recruiting had fallen off because the Volunteers viewed some of the provisions of the Bill with distrust and alarm. Before the Bill was introduced after a lecture he had delivered to his county battalion he managed to get fourteen recruits in quite a small village; and in another village he obtained thirteen recruits. But after the Bill was brought in he went to a town of 4,000 inhabitants, and after the combined efforts of a route march, a band, and his lecture, he secured only three recruits. He asked the reasons for the change and was told that the Volunteers to a considerable extent mistrusted and felt some alarm at various provisions in the Bill. He did not think that some hon. Gentlemen realised the existing difficulty in getting recruits. There was one well-known battalion in the West of England which gave a bonus of 10s. to anyone who raked in a recruit. Of course that practice was not universal. He would give some of the criticisms of a few Volunteer friends on the Bill. The suggested abolition of the Regular adjutant was simply spreading dismay. After all, despite the eloquence of the hon. Member for Leicester, considerable weight should be given to the opinions of experienced men in regard to Army reform. He did not think that the existence in a Volunteer battalion of a professional soldier who knew his work could be seriously objected to. He was worth more in promoting the efficiency of the battalion than all the other officers put together. Another objection to the scheme was that the number of Regular drill instructors was to be enormously decreased. At present there were 2,005 Regular drill instructors, but so far as he understood, the number was to be reduced to 1,453. The Secretary of State in one of his speeches had alluded to the possibility of the drill instructor going round on a bicycle to drill different companies in a county battalion. His own opinion was that to reduce seriously the number of Regular drill instructors would reduce the efficiency of many of the Volunteer battalions. Another objection was to the rules for camp. The men might be frequently soaked to the skin during manœuvres, and they would resent being called upon on return to camp to sit the whole evening in damp clothes. The Volunteer was as proud as any Regular soldier of his smart uniform when he marched out to the admiration of his male and female friends. Then the proposed fine of £5 for failure to fulfil training conditions had caused some mischief. But the chief thing which rankled in the minds of the Volunteers was the virtual obligation to go on foreign service. The Volunteer battalions it was contemplated were to go abroad as units. The battalion would be called out on parade; the Colonel would make a speech and ask all those who volunteered to serve abroad to step out of the ranks. Anyone could see the social and other pressure which would be brought to bear on the men to serve abroad against their will. There was the ill-starred circular of 1905 which suggested that the Volunteers should be medically examined with a view to ascertaining whether they were fit to go on foreign service. In his own battalion fifty men declined to be examined. Of course it was pointed out that during the South African War one-fifth of the Volunteer force volunteered to serve in South Africa, and one-fifteenth did serve. But that was during the war fever at a time of stress. But in 1901, when the War Office invited 10,000 Volunteers, only 1,400 responded to the call. Many Volunteers had no liking for the county associations and disliked still more the prominence given to the lord-lieutenant of the county on these bodies. The Volunteers were the most democratic section of the King's forces, and they asked that instead of this official the chairman should be properly elected by the county association. Even the supply of young officers was, in the future, to be under the control of these effete county officials, many of whom were eaten up with bitter prejudices. Everybody would have thought that at all events they would have been ruled out by the Government. He protested against any public money being expended on this secondary and separate organisation until the needs of the Regular and Territorial Forces had been provided for. The objections raised from the Labour Benches had been raised on the ground of militarism, and he agreed with a good deal of what had been said with regard to boys being taught bayonet exercise under the guise of religion by a bellicose curate not being an edifying spectacle. He objected to the expenditure of money on cadet corps and rifle corps unless it carried with it an obligation on those corps to serve. The cadet corps of schools had no military value whatever. They were run principally on ginger-beer and buns. And with regard to University cadet corps, his own experience at Oxford was that when he asked men to join the corps he had been met with the statement that they had done their part at a public school and they came to the University to enjoy themselves. So far, therefore, from these cadet corps helping the military spirit, they retarded it. The rifle clubs, he submitted, were not worth the outlay expended on them at present. Many members of the rifle corps in England were senior men, and of what value were such men from a military standpoint if they could not take the field? And it would not be fair to ask them to take such responsibility. The kind of optimism shared by some supporters of rifle clubs with regard to these military facts was expressed by the hon. Member for Stoke who informed the House that, if the foot of an invader touched these shores, a million bayonets would glitter in the morning light. A General of Napoleon's once said that they could do anything with bayonets except sit on them. He thought that the glittering bayonets would, in all probability, do more damage to those who had them than to the invader. The hon. Member had also said that if the bayonets were not forthcoming the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State would be hanged. Of this he was sure—that those using the bayonets, if captured by the enemy, would be hanged. All this talk was part and parcel of the nebulous nonsense which did duty in this country for Socialism. Many Members of the House in the dining-room and the lobby and other places, having first told him that they knew nothing whatever about military problems, went on to say that invasion was out of the question. Every military expert in this country and on the Continent, on the contrary, were of opinion that, although invasion would be a difficult matter, the difficulties were not insurmountable. We in England did not face the question fairly. We must remember what the Royal Commission said with regard to the Militia, namely, that it was not in a fit condition after a training of 100 days to take the field in defence of the country. The Militia were trained for sixty-three days and then for twenty-seven, and the training the Territorial Forces were likely to get under the conditions of the present proposals would be more or less on the same lines as the training the Volunteers now got. The Volunteers were now trained for eighty hours in four years and camp was not compulsory. As to the proposal for six months' training, did any one suppose that any hostile European Power which had in its programme the invasion of England was going to hold its hand for six months before it commenced operations? Compulsion being out of the question it seemed to him that the only solution of the problem was to be found in the direction of the Volunteers. There were, of course, difficulties in the way, but it was their duty to face those difficulties and to induce the Territorial Force to undergo longer periods of training. And the only way to do that was to pay them adequately for the time they were engaged. However they were dressed or by whatever name they were called, they would still be amateurs of an inferior type, and anyone who looked at the problem from that point of view could not regard these men as an adequate security against invasion when they contemplated the difference between the training suggested for the Territorial Force and that which would have been undergone by the invaders. This problem of defence far transcended any Party limitations. Volunteers were grateful to the Secretary for War for his untiring work in the cause of Army reform and for being the first British Minister to treat the Auxiliary Forces seriously.

*MR. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.) said that he accepted many of the conclusions of the hon. Member for Leicester, but he did not agree with him as to method or detail. It was necessary first to give this Bill a Second Reading, and then it would be possible to suggest Amendments in detail in the direction in which it was thought it ought to be amended. He felt that, if this Bill were rejected, they would be face to face with chaos so far as the Auxiliary Forces were concerned; and therefore it seemed to him and those with whom he was associated that, while frankly criticising the Bill, they were under some obligation to the House, the country, and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War to co-operate with him in making his scheme successful. If he thought the Bill led them one stage towards conscription he would offer it violent opposition; but he looked on the Bill as containing the germs of a scheme which would put conscription further away, and therefore he supported it, reserving his right to amend it in Committee. After all, Britain was great because she was supreme in the arts of peace and commerce. This country would never be great because she happened to be great in the art of war. Rome as a nation had stood out among the Empires of the world as the first military Empire, but she had passed away in defiance of her military knowledge and military prowess, because she had failed to understand the true meaning of greatness. He recognised that, as long as conditions remained as they were, an Army must be maintained, and common sense told them that it must be an efficient Army. He regretted the enormous expenditure on the Army at the present moment, and he had still to be persuaded that so large an Army was necessary; but he felt that in this Bill, dealing with a Territorial Force, they were called upon to consider an altogether different branch of the question. With regard to officering the Volunteers from the public schools, he asserted that a civic force ought to be based on the broad principle of democracy. It was a mistake to think that in these days the men who would volunteer would be influenced by social position. Those who came into the Force would come in with a much better social position, owing to better education, than that which they before enjoyed, and the officer who was going to win the respect of the men he would have to lead would have to be a man capable of leading them. Therefore, every man having the ability to become an officer should be enabled to rise to the highest grade. He could see no reason why the Volunteers or the Army should be placed under martial law in time of peace. He held very strongly that if a soldier was guilty of an offence in time of peace he ought to be judged, and, on conviction, punished by the Civil courts of the land. He regarded the proposal to put the Volunteers under martial law with the greatest apprehension, and he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would realise that it was impossible to get men with any sense of dignity and manhood to join the Auxiliary Forces if the result was to be the loss of their civic rights in this regard. Pay was also a consideration. If the best type of working man was to associate himself with this movement, the right hon. Gentleman must see to it that it was made possible for him to come out for his training and go into camp without any outlay of money. It was not a question of making money out of it, but unless sufficient pay was given to provide for his wife and family while he was doing his duty to the nation it would be impossible for such a man to associate himself with the scheme. The military force must therefore be reduced to the smallest number, having regard to efficiency. There was every desire among the workers to be in a position to protect their beloved country from invasion, but they must move on practical lines; and it was because this Bill, instead of leading to conscription, really raised a barrier against it, and because the country was in need of some scheme of defence, that he and the group to which he belonged would vote for its Second Reading, reserving to themselves the right to amend it in details.

*MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) desired to say a few words from the point of view of one who was opposed both to conscription and to to universal compulsory military service. Many who favoured compulsory service opposed this scheme because they did not believe that even under the conditions set forth in the Bill there would be a sufficient number of men willing to join the military force of the country. If that were so, what did they propose? They proposed not only to bring in this comparatively small number of unwilling men, but also to force in all the rest of the unwilling to make a competent fighting force. That was a most absurd proposition, and it was useless, because the country would never believe in it or sanction it by its votes. If they believed the country was with them on this question they had only to go to the country and get its sanction. He admitted that it was the duty of those holding his opinions not so much to devise a scheme for the defence of the country as to support such a scheme when it was devised; and it was because he thought that this Bill would provide a properly qualified military force for the needs of the country that he should support the Second Reading. The question was could we under the voluntary system obtain a Territorial Army qualified by its training to perform the duties imposed upon it under this scheme. We did not require an Army huge in numbers composed of unwilling men. He had spent some years in a Yeomanry regiment. He did not wear the glittering panoply of an officer. He had begun as a trooper and had worked his way up until he had been rewarded with the stripes of a sergeant. He looked back on that period as not the least enjoyable in his life. They had done some hard work, and he might give an instance to shew that the training of the Yeomanry in these days, short as it was, had yet produced men capable of holding their own even against the Regular cavalry. He remembered a case where a Yeomanry regiment, owing to the skill which they had acquired, captured the greater part of a cavalry regiment. They had twelve days of training together, and at the end of that time, owing to the admirable zeal of their officers, and not least of the Regular Adjutant, they were, he would not say qualified to bear comparison with the Household Cavalry, but qualified for most of those duties which regiments of cavalry had to undertake in the field. The spirit of that force was remarkable. He remembered the great surprise with which men after their first training received their pay. No thought of pay had entered their mind when joining, and they went into the service because they wanted military work. He believed that the Yeomanry cavalry, after the improvement which had recently taken place, were a most valuable force, and he hoped nothing would be done to check their enthusiasm. He believed it would be possible, by some slight alteration in the scale of pay, to meet all the fair demands of the Yeomanry cavalry, and thus preserve for the country a force which had done very great service in the past. They were told that under this scheme the Militia was being destroyed. If he believed that he would certainly hesitate to vote in favour of the Second Reading of this Bill. The Militia was not being destroyed, it was only being altered, and it would reappear under another name, because every unit of the force was going to be taken over. There was no sanctity in the idea of the three-line system. They had the Regular Army and the Militia. Then came the invasion scare, and in a moment the country was covered with Volunteer regiments. They preferred to remain as an independent force of their own, and in that way the third line of defence arose. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for having brought order out of chaos and for having given them the two-line system under this Bill. There were many points in which alterations in the Bill might possibly be required in Committee. He did not know that he was a very enthusiastic admirer of the county associations, but after considering it he had concluded that if they were to make a beginning at all that was the best way to begin, because they placed a Militia officer at the head of the county association and did their best to interest the great families of the country in the Territorial Force. He would like to know how many Volunteer regiments up to the present time had been assisted by the great families in the country. Those families had always taken a great interest in the Regular Army; in a small way they had interested themselves in the Militia, and the Yeomanry cavalry, but, as regarded the Volunteers, they had taken very little interest in them. The hon. Member for Leicester had told them that the old relations between the Hall and the village were things of the past He had himself had some experience of country districts, and he did not agree with the view of the hon. Member. In political matters the agricultural labourers and those who were at one time supposed to be the dependents of the Hall were perfectly ready to vote against its inhabitants, but in social matters he believed they were still glad to work with them. Although he thought that something better in the end might be devised to take the place of county associations he could not join with those who condemned those associations, because he believed they would form the foundation of an excellent system of local administration. He would not dwell upon such matters as rifle clubs, because he did not think there was much good to be got out of them and they were in no way a substitute for Volunteer regiments. There were other points upon which he might join issue, but on the whole, after carefully studying the Bill and listening to the objections brought against it, he had concluded that the right hon. Gentleman had produced a scheme which, in its essentials, would not only guard them against universal military service, but would properly co-ordinate the various forces of the Crown and give them, without any additional expense, such a system as they had been longing for for a good many years.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The alteration in the hours of the House must be my justification for getting up at an hour when it is not usual for the Leader of the Opposition to ask for the attention of Members. The Minister for War has a great many topics to deal with, and I do not see that it is possible for him to compress an answer to the case which has been made both by friends and foes—and, if he will allow me to say so, by friends quite as much as by foes—in the course of a rather disjointed debate, into less than an hour; and I am therefore compelled to ask the House to listen to me at a rather earlier stage of the proceedings than in other circumstances would be either useful or convenient. I rise to support the Amendment, but I do not do so in any spirit of Party feeling or with any desire to make a difficult task even more difficult than it is. I have been a close spectator, sometimes an actor, in the drama of War Office administration now for many years past. I am profoundly conscious of the difficulties which beset the path, and must beset the path, of any Minister who has to deal with an Army based upon a voluntary system. I believe a voluntary system is a system this country will never consent to abandon, and my sympathy, therefore, is perennially extended to every successive Minister of War, to whatever Party he may belong. I should like to go further. I believe the changes and reforms carried out during the last ten years in the Army have been very great reforms, as they undoubtedly have been very great changes. I believe, when the history of the British Army comes to be written in an impartial spirit, it will be admitted on all hands that Lord Lansdowne, Mr. Brodrick, and my right hon. friend the Member for Croydon have each in their turn and in their measure made a great contribution to this difficult and perennial problem. But I acknowledge at the same time that one of the things which the right hon. Gentleman has set himself to do was not done by his predecessors, and still remains to be done—I mean the problem of providing for the expansion, on the best possible lines, of the Army in time of great national necessity; and, though I do not think that we who sit on this bench have the smallest reason to be otherwise than proud of the work done during the last ten years, it would not be right for us to take up the position of critics of the right hon. Gentleman from the point of view of people who have accomplished this task, which we all admit ought to be dealt with. Therefore, the House will see that when I approach the particular solution the right hon. Gentleman has proposed to us I not only approach that question with a generous sympathy based upon my consciousness of the difficulties which beset every War Minister in this country, but with a feeling that we on this bench have a special reason for not opposing any plan which we think really does solve that part of the problem which we admit was left unsolved when we were succeeded by the right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The House has had to listen to a great many lengthy speeches—not too long, but they have been long, and they have sometimes been long because they have discussed questions which I would venture to put on one side as questions already settled, or at all events, that may be regarded for the purposes of this discussion as provisionally settled. I am not going to say a word, for instance, about the Fleet being our first line of defence, or about the possibility of invasion in great force; I am not going to argue the possibility of raids. I am going to assume for the purposes of everything I say to-day that we may neglect for the moment the possibility of invasion in great force, that we have to admit the possibility of raids, and that the Fleet cannot do its duty as the first line of defence unless there is behind it within the four shores a military force—Volunteer or other—which would make the position of a raiding force when it landed practically untenable. I am going to assume all these things, which I have argued at great length on other occasions in the House, as matters which we may assume without further discussion. As regards the Volunteers, I may perhaps be allowed to say that I have no strong views about the particular plan proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. I am quite sure that we ought to do something to organise the Volunteers better, and I am quite sure that we ought to do something to give them a general staff, to arrange beforehand how they are to meet and deal with particular contingencies which might conceivably arise in the defence of the country, and that we ought no longer to consider them as merely a large and miscellaneous force of fairly well-trained men of whom, somehow or another, in ways unspecified and in plans unmatured, we can make good use in time of national need. I think that much may be done, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman and his military advisers are in the way of doing it, and in so far as that is so he has my hearty support and warm congratulations. But I view with considerable suspicion one class of encomium which I have heard on both sides, and particularly in the speeches, naturally enough, of the right hon. Gentleman's own supporters. The hon. Member who has just sat down and the hon. Member for Leicester both congratulated the Minister for War upon having introduced order where chaos prevailed before, and it has been indicated that the military system of the country was in a confused state, that we had, as it were, a very varied and miscellaneous force, whose efficiency would be immensely increased if only we gave it a different nomenclature and a different organisation. I do not agree with that kind of praise. Remember that if we are all agreed, as we are, that for all our military forces, whether Regulars, Militia, special Reservists, Yeomanry, Volunteers, whatever they may be, we have got to depend upon voluntary enlistment or voluntary engagement to serve—remember that you must make your terms vary and your conditions of service vary with the various classes to whom you appeal. The very fact that a scheme is simple is to my mind not *a priori* in its favour, but against it. If I am told there is a very complicated lock to be undone, if a man comes to me and says, "I am a great believer in simplicity, here is a simple key to undo it," I say, "But you do not fit your means to your end." When you are dealing with so complicated a society as our own, depend upon it, it is not good, but bad, that your system should be artificially simplified, and that you should ignore in any way the varying needs and wishes of the classes on whose voluntary assistance you must depend for obtaining the necessary body of men to defend your interests at home and abroad. And, after all, I am not sure that the plan of the Government really deserves the epithet "simple." I do not think it is simple. You have two lines of defence now before the scheme comes into operation; are you going to have fewer lines afterwards? You will have your Regular Army now, your Militia, your Yeomanry, your special Reservists, differing in their conditions of service every bit as much as the Militia varies from the Regular Army, and both from the Volunteers. There is no simplicity introduced by the scheme of the Government. It is true they sweep away an old historic force, but they do not make the new system simpler than the old. I think we are all apt to be misled by words in this matter. If we look at things, we shall see that probably the result of this plan will be to introduce a greater variety into our system than at present, because at present the War Office does perhaps too much endeavour to run all the Volunteers into one mould. If you are going to leave the county associations really to control in any large measure the force within their respective areas, you may have a different kind of Volunteer, as you may have a different kind of county association. And my confident belief is that, if the Territorial Force as conceived by hon. Gentlemen opposite comes into existence, it will be a more varied force than the Volunteers are at present. But I do not criticise them on that account. On the question of cost the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean made a very able commentary upon the scheme of the Government, in which he indicated his opinion, on what seemed extraordinarily good grounds, that the new scheme would be much more expensive than the old one, as far as the Volunteers and the Militia are concerned. I am not qualified without expert advisers to express an opinion on that point. But it is not on that ground I propose to vote for the Amendment. I propose to vote for it upon much larger and wider grounds. I certainly have no objection in principle to the county associations, but I am very doubtful about this part of the plan. I am not sure that you have not already thrown in the counties so much work upon the only class whose leisure permits them to do it that for any new and great burden thrown upon them you would find them not unpatriotic and not unwilling, but really unable from sheer want of time to carry out the new functions proposed to be placed upon them. The extremely able speech, I am bound to say, of the hon. Member for Leicester suggested to me a new doubt as to the wisdom of the course suggested by the Government. The hon. Member said that the trade unions, the organised labour throughout the country, would strongly object to a large number of the provisions and ideas in the right hon. Gentleman's plan. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Leicester has better means of judging than I have, but the mere fact that a representative of the Labour Party in this House should be in a position to say that shows conclusively that if you do start these county associations you will have, and must have, introduced into it an element which I do not call Party, but which I may, without offence, call an element of social controversy. You will thus have in the very bosom of the new county associations an element of discord introduced which would be absolutely disastrous to the real success of the Volunteers. So far the Volunteers have had their rows; they have had their perennial row with the War Office; they have had their controversy with the military experts; but they have had, apart from these, which are almost an essential part of their being, great liberty and autonomy. Henceforth the various regiments, as I understand, are to be largely under the control of the county associations. The county associations themselves would be placed in such a position that controversy of a difficult and acute kind must needs break out; and this must react on the future organisation of the Volunteers in a manner that, in my judgment, cannot be otherwise than disastrous. I earnestly commend that particular danger to the right hon. Gentleman. And there is one other danger, not, perhaps, quite so serious, which should not be lost sight of. I have told the House that one thing I am afraid of is that there will not be found men of sufficient leisure in various county areas to deal with their new duties. In some counties there is a leisured class, estimable, public-spirited, in every way admirable, but I am not sure that they are admirable for the particular purpose—I mean the retired soldier. He will really have a claim to take part in the management of the work of the county associations. He will have the leisure and the technical knowledge, but I am not sure that the spirit he brings from his training with the Regular Forces is of a kind which will make him in every respect the most sympathetic or competent adviser of the Volunteer Force; and I have a little fear, not only of the trade union element introduced in its councils, if I may be allowed to say so, but also of the professional element which in certain cases will take part in their deliberations. I pass now from the civil side of the Volunteer reorganisation to what I may call the military and the formal side. On the military side the right hon. Gentleman has introduced a kind of uniformity extremely pleasing to the theorists, and by the nature of which all the Volunteers of the country are to be organised in divisions with their proper complement of cavalry and artillery. That scheme looks beautiful on paper; but is it going to help us with the Volunteers? I am not sure, and I will tell the House why. In the first place, are you sure that in a particular divisional area you will find the requisite variation of taste which will give you the number of men anxious to serve in your infantry and Yeomanry, and who will undertake the work of learning to be trained as gunners in a battery? If you do not, you will be doing exactly what should not be done, for you will be forcing into undesired and unexpected moulds the Volunteer elements which otherwise you have at your disposal. I do not see what you are going to get by it. You are going to drill in divisions, but I do not suppose they will go into action in Volunteer divisions, and if you do, then I confess that all the criticisms passed on the Volunteer artillery seem to me to be left wholly unanswered. I do not think we ought to pretend that we have the plan of what is called a national army if the artillery, from the nature of the case, is, and will always be, inadequately trained. An hon. friend, one of the Members for Hampshire, pointed out that the best Volunteer artillery regiments had an immense proportion of Regular officers, and I do not believe, without a very large infusion of Regular officers and highly-trained professional gunners, you will ever get Volunteer artillery to meet on anything approaching equal terms the highly-trained artillery of foreign nations. If that is so, it is really idle to arrange your Volunteers into divisions, if by arranging them in divisions you expect them to become great self-supporting military units—units which can provide infantry, artillery, and cavalry. They will not do so, and when I have had to consider the problem of home defence against raids it has always been on the supposition that the artillery will be supplied from the Regular Army. From the Regular Army I am convinced it must still be supplied, if any good work is to be done in the matter. It may be said, however, that I, perhaps, ignore the six months training which the Bill provides with such material as we have in the Volunteers, and that truly an immense amount of good can be got out of the finest and most teachable material in the country. Are we not here again indulging in illusions? I believe that the arrangement in divisions from the fighting point of view is an illusion, and in the same way is not the six months training when war breaks out an illusion also? The question put by my hon. friend the Member for Fareham is one to which no answer has been given. My hon. friend asked: When war breaks out do you expect the Volunteers to go into camp for six months; and if you expect this, will your expectations be fulfilled? Do you expect the employers in moments of danger to say to their men, "The country is in peril; go into camp for six months"; and my hon. friend asked the Government whether, as the largest employer of labour, they were going to do that—whether they were going to tell their *employés* who belong to Volunteer corps that they should go into training for six months when war breaks out? The Government are not going to do that, and they would be grossly neglectful of their duty if they did do it, because a large number of men would be serving their country more effectively by working in the factories and in the Government departments and in carrying out the great work of civil employment, which, after all, is the necessary background of any military endeavour whatever. If it is true of the Government, is it not then going to be true of the enormous number of great employers of labour in the country? There is no possible answer to the argument of the hon. Member for Leicester. He pointed out that under the terms of conscription you could, without disorganising labour, make enormous drafts on the manhood of the country because the employer knew exactly what he wanted. Every one in Germany, for example, knows that every adult of good physique between certain ages will be called upon to do military service, and knowing that he makes his arrangements accordingly. But if you organise your factories and workshops on an ordinary business basis, and then when war breaks out you suddenly find that a foreman in this department, an expert in that department, a clerk in a third department, have to go into camp for six months, there is a disorganisation of labour, compared with which the loss of labour under compulsory service sinks into insignificance. The hon. Member for Leicester put that point with extraordinary force and clearness; but no answer has been given to it, and I do not believe that any answer can be given. If that is so, are we not cherishing a pure illusion when we draw a picture of the country being suddenly covered with camps and every man of the age included in the Territorial Army leaving his employer and going out to train for six months? It cannot, will not, and ought not to be done; and therefore do not let us assume that we are creating a system under which it will be done. Nothing can be worse for us than to cherish illusions of this character and to suppose that we are creating that which cannot be created, and which, if we could create it, ought not to be created. When the right hon. Gentleman creates a Territorial Army it is not that a million bayonets may flash in the sun because some invader has landed. It is that he may find some machinery for feeding, in case of a great war, the Regular forces of the Crown outside these shores. That is his object. I do not undervalue the Volunteers from that point of view. They did good service in South Africa, and nothing in this Bill that I can see is likely to make the Volunteer more anxious to serve abroad in future wars than he was in the South African War. On the whole, I believe that that war had the warm sympathy of the classes from which the Volunteers are drawn, and I do not believe that you will get a larger proportion of Volunteers to help you abroad in future than you have had in the past. If the right hon. Gentleman can point out anything in the scheme which is going to give a larger proportion of Volunteers serving abroad either as drafts, Regular battalions, or new units, it will have my hearty support; but so far I have wholly failed to find it. While, therefore, I have no vehement objection to this part of the scheme in principle, I am afraid that it will, if carried out, give us an illusory organisation and not a real organisation, the image and pretence of a great Army complete in all its various departments, and not in reality an Army capable of meeting other Armies on equal terms, and that it will introduce in the local management of the Volunteer forces some elements of social controversy and discord which happily have hitherto been wholly absent from their counsels. I now come to the more important part, from the second line to the first line of the Army service. All of us admit that we have a great responsibility and that we must have an Army. I am not going to quarrel about the size of the Army. I see nothing to quarrel with in the general view which the Government hold as to the magnitude of the interests we have to protect and the magnitude of the force we should have to protect them. What are the conditions preliminary to having such a force? I do not know whether my enumeration exhausts them, but there are three which ought never to be forgotten. We ought to be thoroughly provided with all those elements in our force which cannot be improvised. There are some things which I believe, with the Member for Abercromby, you can get under great pressure, not perhaps of the best, but of good quality, pretty quickly; but there are some things you cannot get, and you must not think you can get. You cannot get a trained staff, or highly trained and competent officers. You cannot under any circumstances get either guns or gunners; they all take time. And I would venture to say you cannot even get, or it is very difficult to get, adequate *cadres*. Starting a new regiment is a very serious responsibility; it ought only to be brought into life with caution, and ought to be destroyed only after careful consideration. That is the first condition. The second is that you should have a sufficient number of units; that follows. The third thing is, you must have a sufficiency of drafts, and other means of repairing the tremendous wastage of war, a wastage which in some climates is horrible to think of, but which we must not blink, but must steadily face when we are considering what is necessary. Having laid down those three conditions, which I do not think will be dissented from, I ask myself how the policy of the Government has dealt with them. I am not going to deal in detail with the regiments in the Regular Army, but I must be allowed to say that that policy has destroyed three of the things which I say can hardly be improvised. It has destroyed *ex hypothesi*, and from the nature of the case, a number of *cadres*. That is what the reduction amounts to in the main. It has thrown out of employment—practically limited the number of officers whom we shall have; and, above all, it has reduced the artillery. I frankly admit that I complain of the right hon. Gentleman's method of treating the artillery in all his speeches. I believe it to be perfectly true that he has done a good deal to improve certain classes of men and officers who have worked in the artillery, but nothing can get over the fact that he has diminished their number by 4,000.

MR. HALDANE: I have said that I intend to do it as soon as I can organise the divisional brigade ammunition columns for the purpose, but as these have not been organised yet not a man of the 4,000 has been taken off.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am discussing the plan of the right hon. Gentleman, and I thought the plan was to diminish the artillery by 4,000.

MR. HALDANE: By substituting a larger number trained on a Militia basis; but, as I said, I have not yet been able to work that out.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman will see the point. His plan to increase those services connected with the Militia which can be properly worked on a Militia basis may be very desirable, but those are the very things which can be improvised, provision for which is not absolutely necessary in time of peace. But the trained men whom he is going to get rid of cannot be improvised, they will not be given you by six or even twelve months training when war breaks out, and I fear, therefore, in that connection that he has not carried out one of the most important canons which I have ventured to lay down. I put the artillery in the very first rank of the things you cannot improvise. One other point. There is a controversy between my right hon. friend the Member for Croydon and the Government as to whether we shall really possess 115,000 Regular first-class Reservists. The right hon. Gentleman opposite was good enough to speak to me privately, and to assure me of what I did not need to be assured, that he had done his very best to prepare an accurate statement, and he used some arguments of a very interesting kind. But since then this plain point has been brought to my notice by my right hon. friend the Member for Croydon, which I think every one in the House will understand. The actual first-class Reserve at the present time is 113,000 men, broadly speaking. That Reserve is the product of a Regular Army which is larger by ten battalions that the Army of the future, and which was organised on a three and nine years basis, which, of couse, produces Reservists much faster than would the new Army. Yet we are asked to believe that a smaller Army on a less rapidly Reserve-producing basis is going to give us bigger Reserves than the one which now exists. And remember that these regiments which have only produced 113,000 men at the present time have been in existence seven or eight years, a period long enough to give the full measure of Reservists. How on earth is it possible for the Army of the future, differing for the worse in every particular from the Army of the present as far as Reserve-producing is concerned, to produce a bigger first-class Reserve than the present Army? That is a very great difficulty, into which I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will inquire, and I hope his reply will be as clear and brief, if possible, as has been the argument which I have respectfully addressed to him. I come to the way of dealing with the Militia. The right hon. Gentleman who preceded me said the Militia were not destroyed; they were only transformed. Sir, they are destroyed, and destroyed for the very purpose for which the Militia really exists; and the Government do not pretend that these Militia battalions, transformed into Volunteers or territorial units, are going to perform the function in the future which the Militia has performed in the past. Are we wise to abolish the Militia? I think we are not wise, and that not for historical but for strictly military reasons. The hon. and gallant Member for Abercromby admitted that the Militia had done admirable service in South Africa, but said they did it, not because they were Militia, but because they were Englishmen. Sir, they did admirable service, not because they were Englishmen, but because they were Militia; if they had not been organised as Militia battalions, they could not and would not have done the kind of service which we asked from them, and not in vain, when that great national crisis occurred. The war broke out at the end of 1899, and before April, 1900, was concluded we had got thirty-five Militia battalions out of the country taking the place that would otherwise have been occupied by Regular units. That was an almost incalculable advantage. The Militia are perfectly ready to take the obligation to go abroad, and I think everybody would support a Bill throwing that obligation on them. But you are deliberately going, nominally in the interests of efficiency, to deprive yourself of that which cannot and will not be given you by your seventy-two new battalions of special Reservists. I do not criticise the constitution of the new battalions of Reservists, though I think there are criticisms that might be passed on them; I content myself with one comment—that they cannot be used for the very purpose for which they are most required. The Government say that drafts are what we most require, and that unless they are given a machine which will provide drafts they must abolish everything useless for that purpose. The right hon. Gentleman is a disciple of the Cardwell scheme, a greater believer in it perhaps than I am myself. The Cardwell scheme was that when the two twin battalions were sent abroad a large depot should be formed which should feed those two battalions in the field, and that is, I believe, one very good way of dealing with the question of drafts, which I quite admit has to be dealt with. But in order to deal with drafts in a way not contemplated in the Cardwell scheme, are you seriously, in cold blood, going to abolish regiments which do the duty of Regular troops in certain situations? If we had, through some unhappy fate, to defend the North-West Frontier of India, your Militia battalions would take the place of Regular battalions in garrisons in the Mediterranean; some of them might even take the place of Regular troops in the heart of India itself. The very existence of this force, especially reformed and modified as it ought to be reformed and modified, would enormously increase the efficiency of your Regular Army, because it frees your Regular Army to do that which only Regular troops can do, and it puts troops less efficient and less costly to do less important work like guarding the lines of communication. It is impossible for me to believe that that does improve the efficiency of the Regular Army, and that it does improve our possibility of waging a great war. It does not. I agree that the problem of reforming the Militia, which will have to be undertaken as an alternative to this scheme if it is abandoned, is a very difficult problem. But do not let us put it out of our power to reform the Militia by destroying the Militia itself. In the great wars in which we have been engaged in the past, the work of the Militia in our own lifetime has been done by the Militia cheaply and efficiently. No one who has had experience of these great wars would say that that work could or ought to be done by the Regular Army. If the Volunteers do not do it the Special Reservists cannot do it. The Special Reservists are not intended, and are not organised, to go abroad; their whole theory is that they cannot fight as units. The only thing that is left then is the Militia, and the Militia you intend to destroy. These are the reasons why I feel that I cannot be responsible, directly or indirectly, for the plan of the Government. Even by the friends of this scheme it has been admitted that the Government are risking the very existence of the Volunteers. It is admitted even by those who have asserted with the most ardour that they will vote for the Second Reading, that unless the terms of the Yeomanry engagement are changed the Yeomanry will go; and unless the severity of the discipline in the Bill be altered the Volunteers, even if they do not go, will at all events cease to come. Your scheme, therefore, threatens your home Army—what you not very accurately call your citizen Army; it destroys drafts for your Regular Army; it throws upon Regular units responsibilities and labours which ought to be undertaken by a less costly and less highly-trained force, and which there is no possibility of this House ever consenting to see carried out by an augmentation of the number of the Regular battalions in the service of the country. If that view be accurate, however anxious we may be—and we are all anxious—to help the right hon. Gentleman in carrying through any well-considered scheme, I think he will feel with me that we on this side of the House have no choice but to take the only constitutional method of dissociating ourselves from any responsibility for this schene which, with so much ability and faith, he has developed before us, by voting for the Amendment of my right hon. friend.

* MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.) said he would not have ventured to intervene in the debate, in which so many experts had taken part, especially men who were engaged with the recruiting of the Auxiliary Forces of the country, had there not been one particular point in the Bill in regard to which he had a certain amount of personal experience and of the extreme importance of which he was thoroughly convinced. The point upon which he wished to speak had reference to the artillery and especially in regard to one department of it, the recruiting of the drivers of that force with a view of replacing the wastage in war. As he had said, his only excuse for troubling the House was that he had had practical experience in the French Army of driving guns. He knew what it was to drive a gun, and he wished to speak upon certain points of which he had knowledge, the first being the great importance of having a sufficiency of trained artillery drivers, and the second was to urge the supreme importance of that particular arm. This latter point was the one upon which he wished most to insist. The one great war of modern times in which the opposing forces were nearly balanced in numbers and intelligence, the only war of that character which had taken place in Europe recently, was the Franco-German War of 1870. If they considered that struggle it could be proved that it was the superiority of the German artillery which decided the decisive actions. He would be prepared, were the task a sufficiently useful one, even with regard to actions he had not closely studied, to say beforehand, from his intimate knowledge of that great campaign, that it was the artillery which decided the whole thing. He would take one particular example, that of the fight before St. Privat on the 18th August. The strategical effect of that battle was this. If the two main French armies could have effected a junction it would probably have changed the current of the war, but their junction was, after three days fighting, which were known collectively as the Battle of Gravelotte, prevented by the taking and capture of the village of St. Privat by the Germans. From half past ten in the morning till dusk of a summer's day practically the whole of the fighting was done by the German guns which were directed against the French position at St. Privat. It was this last bit of fighting before St. Privat, in which the French artillery was outclassed by that of their opponents, that did more than anything, in a battle which decided the fate of Europe, to influence the fortunes of the day. The guns did the work. He knew very well that there was a certain amount of prejudice, not among the learned Army experts, but among the journalistic experts in regard to the full value of artillery. One was told that it made a noise, and it certainly did do that. Then one was told that the effect of it upon any Army was only a moral one, but it would be found that in the best Army schools, certainly in Italy and France, and at last even in Germany, the importance given to artillery to-day was overwhelming. In this country, however, a long succession of campaigns fought against enemies who, though by no means despicable, were not armed with guns, and which were fought under conditions in which we should never fight in Europe, had left in us something of a prejudice against the value of artillery. He, however, was convinced personally by his reading and experience, and by the

traditions of his family which were not slight, that notwithstanding the considerable changes in artillery during the last thirty years, there still remained as one of its most important elements the simple human factor, the driver. The gunner who laid the guns had varied in his importance, but the driver must be highly trained, and there should be a sufficiency of that class. Although the functions of the gunner had altered, those of the driver remained the same to-day as in the past, and he was often in greater demand than he was before and was put into a position of greater danger. The driver always had to be fairly near his gun, otherwise the carrying of ammunition to it would be cumbrous. We certainly, if unhappily we became engaged in a great war, would be involved in a very heavy loss indeed if we had not a sufficient number of trained drivers for our guns. This was a matter of which a man could only speak from personal experience, and he said that to drive a gun was an exceedingly difficult matter. Three men had to deal with six horses, each leading one and riding another, drawing a gun weighing about two tons, and it had to be taken through all sorts of country. He could not describe to the House what it meant to go through a small ditch with a hedge on the other side, with two tons behind one, leading one horse and riding another. It was a work which no amateur could undertake; it required special training for years. He himself had never been allowed to take charge of the wheelers or the leaders, but had only had the other horses, and he had never heard of any man being made a competent driver of the wheelers or the leaders who had not had at least two years experience and training of a very arduous sort. Even these two years stood for training very difficult to give under Volunteer discipline, and which could only be given under the conditions which conscription afforded. We had at the present moment the heaviest field gun in the world, the 18-pounder. It was a matter of some importance as to whether we had done right or wrong in choosing so heavy a type, but anyhow we had behind the horses a greater weight than any artillery in Europe, and we wanted if anything greater skill added to that which we had at this moment. So important and minute was the proper training of a driver that if possible a man should be got to know his horses, and, save for feeding them, which was done by the stable guard, should learn to know his horses by every method in which man and horses could be kept together, in order to become acquainted with each other. They should be kept together throughout. The losses among these trained men would be immensely heavy at the beginning of a war, and where that occurred it was utterly irreparable unless we had a very large trained Reserve. At the battle of Sedan the battery to which he was subsequently attached lost every commissioned and non-commissioned officer except one non-commissioned officer who saved his piece. The proportion of loss in killed and wounded, officers and men, upon that occasion was 75 per cent. Artillery duels would be even more serious now than they were in 1870, and if the loss was irreparable we should lose the pieces and the battle. If it was said that our military system, historical tradition, and social condition, were such as to make us largely rely on auxiliaries who were only partially trained, there was the example of Austria which also depended to some extent on a Reserve not trained. But the great Reserve of Austria-Hungary was the artillery, and the artillery was well trained and was jealously reserved for the profession. There was another and sentimental aspect of the matter, an aspect that ought to be dear to every Englishman. English drivers at the present moment had deservedly the highest reputation in the world. Service, long service, and tradition had been responsible for that, as also the fact that their officers escaped the regimental system. The regimental system did not obtain in the artillery, and promotion was out of a larger body. They had that reputation in foreign armies. During a period when foreign opinion was directed with peculiar bitterness against this country he heard in a foreign tongue enthusiastic praise of the action of our drivers at Colenso. There had hardly ever been a more gallant act than that of Lord Roberts' son and his comrades. They did not get a thing like that done unless there was a magnificent professional tradition behind it. He did not believe they could get a reserve of drivers trained on a Militia basis worthy and able to take the place of the trained drivers we should lose at the beginning of a great war.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said that on broad principles he was entirely at one with the right hon. Gentleman, but when they went further he did not agree. In the last few years several doctors had prescribed for the Army, and now the right hon. Gentleman had come along and said it had been treated quite wrongly, its system had been built up too much, and what was required was a little lowering medicine together with a little amputation. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would have been wise in considering this scheme if he had realised that these constant changes had had a very bad effect in deterring fathers from sending their sons into the Regular Army. They had also had a prejudicial effect on the Auxiliary Forces in preventing recruits from joining. The Bill, however, was before the House, and, that being so, it must be considered. When the right hon Gentleman came down and said that for fourteen months he had not scorned to live laborious days, and that this was the scheme his labours had produced, it behoved the House to give the Bill a respectful consideration. The right hon. Gentleman had informed them in one of the numerous memoranda with which he had inundated the House that he aimed at having a force of 300,000. He had, therefore, reduced the Auxiliary Forces by 74,000 men, and was apparently saving a million sterling. That was no doubt gratifying to those who considered that we ought to reduce our expenditure at all hazards. It was not so to him. But the right hon. Gentleman had quite forgotten that these auxiliaries would require guns, equipment, drill halls, rifle ranges, and other things, all absolutely necessary, and finally there was the expense of the cadet and rifle corps. That, according to the right hon. Gentleman's own statement on the 25th February, would entail a cost of £1,500,000, which, added to the £2,900,000, came out at £4,400,000. So that what the right hon. Gentleman had really done was to reduce the Auxiliary Forces by 74,000 men and increase the cost by £400,000. What was his proposal with regard to the Yeomanry? At present we had 26,000 effective Yeomen recruited from a class of men nearly all of whom had a grammar or higher school education, who with sixteen days training had picked up a surprising amount of knowledge, and who surprised the inspecting officers by the excellence of their work Their pay was now to be decreased to an alarming extent. The Yeomanry did not go out to make money, but it was quite a different thing to ask them to come out and serve the country and pay for it out of their own pocket. The right hon. Gentle man had said he proposed to relieve the financial liabilities of the commanding officers of the Volunteers, and start them fair to do their work. That was a most excellent proposal, but why should the commanding officers be freed, and the wretched Yeomanry and Volunteer privates docked of their pay? They were to be paid a sweating wage, and the result would be that only an inferior class of recruits would be obtained. It would be impossible to keep up the Yeomanry with such inferior material. He would say very little about the Militia, as their case had been so well put by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover. But he must say one word with regard to what had fallen from the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby division, in reference to obtaining recruits for the Militia. He knew that it was difficult to get recruits, but the hon. and gallant Gentleman had said that the only place where recruits could be found was among the miners of the north of England and in Scotland. Did the hon] and gallant Member recollect that there was a large floating population in London who filled the ranks in a great many of the Surrey, Middlesex, and Home County regiments? Had he considered the miners in South Wales, who formed some excellent engineering corps? Above all, the hon. and gallant Member had shown a surprising ignorance of the conditions in his own constituency. Had he ever heard that there were 30,000 dock labourers in Liverpool, of whom only 15,000 were in permanent employ; a great many of whom, with others, had joined the Militia regiments, of which they were very proud? The steamers which sailed out of Liverpool had a large number of stokers on board, many of whom spent their annual holiday by joining the Militia regiments, getting the benefit of the fresh air and good food while out training. He thought he had shown that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had made a rather sweeping assertion. The Bill of the right hon. Gentleman was not a very popular one, because it made scrap heap of this old and historic force, which did such good work not only in the Peninsula and the Crimea, but in South Africa. Then he passed to the Volunteers, to whom the right hon. Gentleman offered pay ludicrous in amount. For fifteen days training the Volunteer was to have the magnificent sum of 1s. per day. Let them take the instance of a married man in a London corps. The majority of men in London corps were married men, and the average of their families might be taken at two each. He took for illustration the case of a married man with a wife and two children, and in receipt of 35s. a week. What would be his budget for a fortnight? He would have to pay, say 5s. a week to lodge his family, and he would have to provide 10s. a week to feed them. Therefore if he was fifteen days in camp he would have to find 30s. What did the right hon. Gentleman give him? He was going to give him 15s., therefore the Volunteer would have to find 15s. out of his own pocket for his wife and children, have absolutely nothing for himself, besides losing his wages. Was not the idea ludicrous? They were dealing not with a conscript Army, but with free and voluntary enlistment, and if men were not given money they simply would not come. Last year the corps which he had in his mind gave each man 2s. 6d. a day out of the 5s. capitation grant. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had said that in some cases as much as 4s. a day had been given, but the average was from 1s. 6d. to 3s. In the corps which he was talking about it was 2s. 6d.; therefore the man got £1 17s. 6d., out of which he had to pay 30s. for lodging of wife and children, leaving him 7s. 6d. in hand—6d. a day to provide himself with tobacco and a drink of beer after the day's work or any little thing that might be necessary. But under the conditions which the right hon. Gentleman proposed it was perfectly impossible to suppose that any man would join. Next he wanted to draw the attention of the House to Sections 6 and 8 of the Bill, because they seemed the most extraordinary sections he had ever come across. He had taken legal opinion upon them, and it bore out his view that if a man in Hampshire, say, wished to join, he could go to the recruiting officer and say he wished to join the Territorial Army, but he would not be allowed to say that he desired to join any particular regiment or even branch of the service; he had absolutely to join for general service. A successful cross-country rider might apply to join the Territorial Army in some particular Yeomanry regiment and he might be put into a foot regiment. Did the right hon. Gentleman realise that recruiting at the present moment was not by regiment or battalion but by company? A man would say that he wanted to go into Captain So-and-So's company. Now they were going to ask him to enlist in an Army corps for the county, and the right hon. Gentleman was also going to take power to transfer him after he had joined. After having been in the Yeomanry for two years, a man might be transferred to the infantry. The only protection he had was that he was not to be transferred from Hampshire, say, to Essex or Surrey. Except in that respect, he might be moved about at the will of the War Office. He thought that Members of the House would see the absurdity of the proposal. Was anybody going to enlist under such conditions, especially when they remembered that in the Regular Army a man could enlist into a particular regiment? He would not deal with the question of Regular adjutants, because he took it that, after what was said by the hon. Member who sat behind the right hon. Gentleman on the last day the Bill was discussed, that part of the Bill had been practically abandoned. Finally he came to the point which he especially wished to bring before the House, and that was with reference to Clause 12 of the Bill, which said—

> "Any part of the Territorial Force shall be liable to serve in any part of the United Kingdom, but no part of the Territorial Force shall be carried or ordered to go out of the United Kingdom."

That carried out the idea that the Volunteer Force was intended for home defence; but the clause went on to say—

> "Provided that it shall be lawful for His Majesty, if he thinks fit, to accept the offer of any part or men of the Territorial Force, signified through their commanding officer, to

subject themselves to the liability to serve in any place out of the United Kingdom."

That perpetuated a statute to which, personally, he had always objected when it was applied to the Militia. The truth was that the State, when it enlisted a man, ought to tell him what exactly was his liability. A man for family reasons might not want to serve abroad, though perfectly willing to serve at home. Now the right hon. Gentleman proposed that, when the first class Army Reserve was called out, the whole Territorial Force should be embodied for the period of six months. That embodiment was not chiefly intended to meet raids and invasion, because if it had been meant for that the right hon. Gentleman would have given himself power to call out a portion only of the Territorial Force, as it was obvious that in case of a war with Russia it would not be necessary to call out the whole of the Territorial Force in order to repel an invasion or a raid. Our fleet could guarantee us against that. But he believed that they might consider that the embodiment of the Territorial Force for six months was entirely to fit them for service outside of the United Kingdom. If that was so, he did not think that it was right that they should pass the Bill in the form which the right hon. Gentleman wished, because it would be enlisting men under one set of rules, and asking them to carry out something quite different. The better plan, it seemed to him, would be that, under the direction of the War Office, every county association should have the power to ear-mark certain units within their association who should be composed of men who, when they enlisted, expressed themselves as willing to serve abroad when the First Class Army Reserve was called out; the remaining units should not be called upon to serve abroad as units, though individuals might volunteer from them for foreign service. He could not see why that could not be carried out; why should they not allow the Militia and the Yeomanry to form these foreign service units in the Territorial Army? They knew that both the Militia and the Imperial Yeomanry were ready to go abroad in their units if called upon. When they merged into the Territorial Force, why should they not allow them to consist entirely of young men willing to serve abroad in a grave national emergency, and let them be reinforced if necessary from the home battalions in order to bring them up to strength? The advantage of such a proposal was that the right hon. Gentleman would know what number he had to rely upon in case of emergency. Had he now the slightest idea of how many of the proposed Territorial Force would volunteer for Foreign Service in case a war broke out? If it happened to be a popular war he might get a large percentage of them, but if it should turn out unpopular, then the percentage would be very small indeed. Another advantage would be that a man perfectly willing to serve his country at home, but perhaps for family or business reasons not willing or able to serve abroad, would be able to enlist, secure in the knowledge that if war broke out he would only be called upon to serve his country against foreign invasion. It might be said that such people belonged to stay-at home battalions, and they would possibly be laughed at. He was aware that this had been said when the proposal was made to have two active service companies in each battalion, but there was a very great difference between two companies in a battalion and keeping a regiment of that kind in each county. They might include the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers in this Territorial Force, and lay down that the Militia and Yeomanry should take on the liability to serve abroad, leaving the Volunteers as at present to come forward to defend their hearths and homes and have a saving clause that the Volunteers or the stay-at-home people should be allowed to Volunteer as individuals, but not as units, in order to supplement the foreign service battalions. He considered that unless the Bill was very greatly changed in Committee it would have most disastrous results, and the upshot would be that the Regular Army would be reduced by 20,000 men, the Yeomanry by 50 per cent., the Militia would be abolished, and the Volunteers irritated and discouraged.

*Captain KINCAID-SMITH (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon) said he would like to make an allusion to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman first of all sympathised with the Secretary of State for War in the extreme difficulty and complexity of his task. He also stated that his three predecessors at the War Office had not been able to do one thing, and that was to provide the expansive system required, and he further stated that the present Secretary of State for War had also failed in that respect. Personally he did not agree with that statement, and he was supporting this scheme because he believed that for the first time they were taking a step towards providing that reservoir of men and that Reserve which was required to reinforce the Regular professional Army in times of emergency. Whether the Territorial Army was to be filled by Volunteers or by compulsion, it was the first step towards providing that essential condition always insisted upon by the Leader of the Opposition in any scheme of Army reform. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. Member for Leicester, the first part of his speech seemed to be one long complaint against the military side of the War Office. He complained that various schemes had been brought down to the House, and each time the Secretary of State for War had stated that they were backed by expert military opinion. The answer to that remark was the extreme difficulty and perplexity of the problem which they had to solve. What was now placed before them was one of the alternatives, and every alternative must be tried. There was not a single scheme which could be put forward by any member of the Labour Party or by anyone else which could not be picked to pieces in five minutes by the Leader of the Opposition, and probably by any other Member of the House. The hon. Member for Leicester's chief complaint against the scheme was that it would increase the military spirit or what the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had called public spirit. To him it was immaterial what sort of spirit it was if it produced that willingness to undergo the small amount military of training required by the regulations laid down in this Bill. It had been said time after time by members of the Labour Party that the scheme was the first step towards conscription, but it was nothing of the sort. The country was not going to be coerced into conscription, and no system of universal military training could be introduced in this country except with the almost unanimous consent of the nation. Continental countries had not adopted their system of compulsory military service from any love of that service or from any sense of their duty as citizens, but simply because it was necessary for their national security that they should maintain a great professional army, and if it could be proved that it was unnecessary to keep such a great standing army they would very quickly express their disapproval of it. He would like to read an extract from a manifesto by the Social Democratic Federation. The manifesto he alluded to said—

> "We want no class of men set apart from their fellows, but we want a national citizen force in which while every man will be a soldier no man will cease to be a civilian. Such a force is not conscription, which can only be successful by securing that every man shall be trained in the use of arms as a civilian."

He would commend those sentiments to the Leader of the Opposition. That was an extract from a manifesto issued by the Social Democratic Federation, and it read almost like an extract from any leaflet issued by the National Service League: some of the sentiments were most admirable. He thought they might congratulate themselves upon the great value such sentiments would have in raising the Territorial Army. The point was, would they be able to fulfil the aspirations expressed in that manifesto without compulsion? The underlying principle of one of the speeches which had been delivered from the Labour Benches was that they would be opposed to any reduction in the Regular professional Army until they had some civilian Army on a semi-trained basis on which they could rely. He for one would be very much opposed to any further reduction in the professional Army until they had the Territorial Army organised on a reliable basis. He supported the Bill because he believed that for the first time it, so to speak, co-ordinated all the different Auxiliary Forces into one uniform body and made the civilian community responsible for the maintenance, and to a certain extent responsible for the organisation of the new Territorial Army. In time of peace the civilian community had not sufficiently recognised its responsibility for the maintenance of the Auxiliary Forces. He believed this scheme did provide the organisation required, and it would form a reservoir and a vast reserve of men on a semi-military basis which could be drawn upon to reinforce the Regular professional Army in time of emergency. A great many hon. Members, especially on the Ministerial side of the House, had expressed some nervousness about the increased size of the expeditionary force. He did not think there was much danger, and he was sure there was no necessity to be nervous about that. They had the men on paper and they might as well organise them on paper. The bald fact remained, however, that the expeditionary force outside the administrative departments which was on a semi-Militia basis was the same as before, minus those by which the Regular Army had been reduced. A great many hon. Members had expressed various opinions as to whether the Territorial Army would be sufficiently attractive to get the number of men required. Upon that point his opinion was absolutely valueless, and he did not think anybody's opinion upon it would be worth much. Nobody could tell whether the Territorial Army now proposed would attract sufficient men to make it a success; they could only find that out after two or three years experience. He fully realised the great difficulty in the case of working men, especially those employed in skilled trades, in giving up even the little time required under the Volunteer Regulations. He did not, however, think that those considerations would justify a great many others who were often more comfortably situated, sometimes with complete leisure, and who had not identified themselves in any way with any branch of the Auxiliary Forces. He thoroughly agreed with the principles advocated by the National Service League, but he would like to hear a little less about the duty of the working classes in this matter and a little more about the duty of those who had a good deal more leisure. The hon. Member for the Abercromby Division had recently made a very interesting speech about the Swiss Army. He had praised the Swiss Army as a model for us to follow, in our Territorial Army. He had also referred to it as an illustration of the state of efficiency to which an Army can be raised if constituted solely on the Militia basis. He agreed with the hon. Member that it was an excellent model in that respect, but it was not true to say that as a fighting force it would be equal without further training to the professional soldiers of other Continental countries. He thought the hon. Member had left out of his narrative what must have been the most interesting part of the information he gathered when looking at the Swiss Army. The hon. Member did not state whether in the opinion of responsible people in Switzerland the same results could be obtained without compulsion. He himself thought he was right in saying that the opinion was almost unanimous that, without compulsion, the same results could not be obtained. The hon. Member had said that we approved apparently of the Swiss Army as a model for the Territorial Army because compulsion was imposed. But that was not the reason why we approved of it. It was because the Swiss system would give us the expansible system which everyone admitted was required in this country. We did not approve of it because it was constituted on the basis of compulsion. The hon. Member had said that with compulsion in this country we should find it more difficult to get men for the various punitive expeditions which we were obliged to engage in. But even if we had compulsion we should require a regular professional Army very much reduced, and this force would always be available for these expeditions. He never believed that there could be any difference in the fighting value of a man who was forced to be a soldier and a man who came forward voluntarily, provided they were fighting for a good case and had the feeling that they were fighting for national existence. He instanced the war in Manchuria as an illustration of that. He did not think that by the greatest stretch of imagination anybody would say that the soldiers on one side were animated by the idea that they were fighting for national existence and their homes many thousand miles away. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had voiced the case of the Militia. Many people who had served in that force and who were at present serving in it naturally did not like it to be abolished. Nobody liked to be legislated out of existence, from the owners of public-houses to Militia battalions. A great many Members, no doubt, belonged to

Militia battalions with fine old traditions, and pressure had been brought upon them to oppose the present scheme. But looking at it impartially, something had got to be done to reorganise the force. He believed that one of the truest statements made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover was that if they wished for uniformity in the Territorial Army, in the end compulsion would be necessary. He himself said, "Let us give the scheme a chance." It could only be seen in a few years time whether it would be a success. He believed it would be a success if they raised the pay of the Territorial Army to the pay of the Yeomanry. He suggested also that as an inducement everyone joining the Territorial Army of twenty-one years of age should have the franchise extended to them. If some privilege of that sort were conferred he thought the Territorial Army might be made a success, but unless they did something like that, and raised their pay to that of the Yeomanry, he did not believe they would get a sufficient number of men, so that they would be able to reject the physically unfit and yet get a sufficient number to make the scheme a success. Personally, he would be quite prepared if the scheme did not prove a success to support any right hon. Gentleman who would come forward and say that having tried every other alternative there was nothing left but to have a small Regular professional Army for foreign service and a compulsorily trained civilian Army for home service. He believed that was a policy which would be in the end cheerfully accepted by the country.

*MR HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that a short time ago an hon. Member, on the other side of the House, speaking as a Volunteer officer, stated that compulsion was impossible. He ventured to ask "Why?" and the hon. Member replied, "Ask your constituents." He had asked his constituents, and his difficulty with them so far had been to get anybody to oppose compulsory military training at all. He believed that if hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House would take their courage in both hands and tell their constituents that it was the duty of every man to learn enough to be able to defend his country in times of great national peril, it would not only do them no harm politically, but would probably in most cases do them a considerable amount of good. The hon. Member for Leicester had told the House that he was entirely against anything like teaching children in schools military exercises, or teaching them to shoot. The hon. Member said it would have the effect of causing them to believe that force was a remedy. He himself believed that it was absolutely true that force was really the only ultimate remedy. He put it to hon. Gentlemen opposite who did not believe in force, and especially to one hon. Gentleman opposite who was now there: If it had not been for the "gentlemen in blue" how could they have prevented the seried ranks of the gallant suffragettes from invading the sacred precincts of the House of Commons? That he thought was distinctly a case in point. The only thing that really told ultimately in this world was force, and they must recognise that that was absolutely true. The hon. Member for Stoke, who was a trained soldier and must know what discipline meant, had told the House that if this country was invaded one night the next morning there would be a million dripping bayonets. He thought the hon. Gentleman who had seen much active service and had honourably gained His Majesty's medals should not tell people that sort of thing. To begin with, there were probably not a million bayonets in the country. He did not think there were a million rifles. He believed that a regiment of trained soldiers from the Continent would swamp our patriotic million of men who were armed simply with bayonets. It seemed to him that this new Army scheme would put the country in an even more dangerous and defenceless position than at the present time. It appeared that under it we should be short, counting their Reserves, of very nearly 40,000 of our best trained infantry, besides losing somewhere about 3,800 trained artillery men, with no certainty whatever of getting any other force to make up for their loss. They could not make trained artillery men in much under three years. The Secretary of State for War was built on Herculean lines of physique as well as of intellect, but he appeared to be trying to get a voluntary Army on the cheap, and that was a very difficult thing to do, even in a country like this of heavily taxed imported necessaries and also heavily taxed exports.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln) said that there was a point of some public importance involved in this Bill, to which there was a very wide opposition in his constituency, because one of the provisions gave power to obstruct the waterway over the river Trent by the erection of a bridge across it. That waterway was of real importance and value to many industries in that part of the country. He was informed that some 2,000,000 tons of traffic passed up and down it in the course of a year. The bridge was proposed to be erected at such a point that owing to the rapidity of the tide and the shifting nature of the channel it would prove a most serious obstruction to navigation, if it did not lead to the practical cessation of the use of the waterway. He had a Motion on the Paper "That the Bill be read a second time this day six months," and if some modification of the plans were not made to secure the unimpeded navigation of the river, he would reserve his right to continue his objection to the passing of the Bill. His contention was that great railway companies had no right to cripple and strangle the waterways of the country.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport) said there was no doubt that this particular Bill was of great interest to the district where the proposed bridge was designed to be placed. The Trent was unquestionably an important link in the system of inland navigation between the Midlands and York, and the opposition to the bridge represented by the numerous petitions against the Bill was not confined to one particular locality. The Trent was a most important river; and the Board of Trade had a particular interest in the matter as trustees for the public in the oversight of tidal rivers. The Board of Trade had sent down one of their technical advisers who had investigated the subject thoroughly on the spot and had prepared a Report which would be presented to Parliament within the next few days. That Report would be available for the use of the Committee upstairs, and Board of Trade witnesses would be available to be examined by the Committee. He therefore asked the House to send the Bill to the Committee upstairs, and he could assure his hon. friend that his constituents would have the fullest opportunity of bringing their case before that Committee.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question [9th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, though anxious to increase the capacity for expansion of the Forces of the Crown in time of war, regrets that the Government should make proposals which, while destroying the Militia, discouraging the Yeomanry, and imposing new and uncertain liabilities on the Volunteers, would not, in a period of national peril, provide an adequate force for Home defence or prompt support for the Regular Army in the field.'—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof, resumed."

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. HUNT, continuing his speech, said that it appeared to him that the Secretary of State for War, a Liberal Minister, had been obliged to go down on his bended knees to the Lords-Lieutenants of counties, Peers and country gentlemen—most dreadful people according to Liberal ideas—and beg them to subscribe handsomely, and to use all their social influence in order to make this Bill work in an economical and satisfactory way. The Liberal Party, it seemed to him, had fallen rather low when they had to face the real situation in office, considering that they began their career with such high hopes and proud aspirations. Many hon. Members on the Ministerial Benches had told them that this country would never have conscription; but some of them did not know what conscription meant. They had mixed up universal military training with conscription. Conscription meant the taking by lot or by force a certain number of men of the country who were then compelled to serve in a long-service aggressive army for a number of years and compelled to fight in any part of the world to which they might be sent. Universal compulsory military training, on the other hand, was the most democratic Army scheme that had ever been invented, and the most just. No man under it was obliged to fight except in defence of his own country. Rich and poor alike served in its ranks. He thought it was a great pity that the people of this country did not understand the difference between the two. It appeared to him as if, to a great extent, this country was ruled by words, and he hoped that in time the people would learn that conscription had really nothing whatever to do with universal military service. In regard to the Yeomanry, as far as the regiment to which he belonged was concerned, this Bill would take away from their pay something like 3s. per day. The men now got 5s. 6d. a day, but that was to be reduced to 1s. 6d., and as their messing now cost them 1s. a day, it meant that they would lose 3s. a day during the training. That was a very serious matter, because the men consisted chiefly of small crofters, gillies, gamekeepers, and when they went home from the Yeomanry training some of them took back with them as much as from £8 to £12, which was a great help to them to get over the winter. On those lines, he thought the Bill would do a great deal of harm to that class of Yeomanry. On the other hand, in other regiments the big farmers came out, meaning to have a good time as well as for patriotic feeling; and the Bill would have a bad effect on them, because they would have to pay out a considerable amount of money instead of, as at present, being able to live well on their pay. By doing away with the Militia, the Bill would make it more difficult to get recruits for the Regular Army than at present. With the exception of 75,000 men the rest of the National Army would be rather less fitted to face an invading Army than the Militia and the Volunteers at the present time. He thought that the War Minister had begun his training at the wrong end. If the right hon. Gentleman had begun with six months training the Territorial Army might have been very useful, but it was perfectly ridiculous to imagine that foreign nations were going to allow us six months to train our men in order to suit our convenience after the outbreak of war. He thought the Volunteers and the Militia to a large extent came from different classes, and it was quite a question whether the War Office could induce them to be mixed up together, eight or ten in a tent in peace time. The range accommodation in many of the camps was very bad, and as the time in camp was only ten clear days he did not see how the men were going to be properly trained. Ten days clear was not more than enough to train a big battalion in musketry alone, and how they were to be trained in that and other matters in the time he was quite unable to understand. There was another point which he thought would affect the Volunteers very seriously. Formerly the Militia had always stood between the Volunteers and embodiment, but now it seemed there was to be nobody to stand between the Volunteers and that operation, as the Militia did in 1882, and all those who formerly served in the Volunteers would be liable to be called up at any time when danger threatened for six months of continuous military service. He thought it was extremely doubtful whether the Volunteers or those who were suitable for the new Territorial force would accept the very severe extra responsibility. Another thing which seemed to him very difficult was, how the Field Artillery were to be trained during such a very short time to be of any real use in war. There would also be a difficulty about getting officers now in the Militia to join the new Territorial force, as about a third of them did not live in the county in which they now served. He was told that the majority of the Militia officers absolutely declined to serve in this new force of 75,000 men. It seemed to him that under this scheme they would destroy the Militia and reduce the Volunteers without any certainty of getting men to fill their places. Even supposing that they did get the men and the officers, was it in any way fair or right that 300,000 men, out of many millions, should take upon themselves alone the whole of the self-sacrifice and risk of defending their country in time of national peril? It did not seem to him in the least fair. Many of these men would be artisans, mechanics or clerks, earning perhaps two pounds a week as long as they kept their health. They probably got only about one whole week's holiday during the year, and yet for the sake of serving their country they devoted that holiday to attending their annual training, whilst there was a considerable number of men who had been left a good bit of money by somebody, and who had plenty of time and leisure, but who did not do anything to fit themselves to serve their country in time of need. For himself he could not help thinking that if they could have thrown a net over the 80,000 young men who attended the great football match the other day at the Crystal Palace as spectators only, it would have been a very good thing indeed to have secured them and put them through four months continuous military training and instruction. He could not help thinking that the Secretary of State for War might as well have grasped his nettle and proposed four months continuous military training for every man once in his life between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, and also military drill and shooting in all schools, for all boys over eleven years of age. Surely it was not too much to ask of every young man who had the privilege of being a member of the British Empire that he should undergo this small amount of training. He thought that if the question were fairly placed before the people of this country they would be very glad to agree to it. His own experience was, that although in his constituency, just before Parliament met, they held four meetings in four towns in different parts of the division—one of them in particular where the political views of the people were opposed to his—they could not get anybody to oppose the principle that it was the duty of every man to learn enough to be able to defend his country and his country's women and children in time of need. If British men were not able and willing to defend their country, and their country's women and children, who could be expected to do it for them? They might at all events perhaps agree that although we were a most peace-loving nation it was impossible for us by peaceable means to make other nations the same. It had been our boast for a great number of years that we were a free country, and what he was trying to impress upon the people about him was that if we wanted to remain a free country we must be prepared to fight for our freedom like all the other great European nations. The idea was quite recognised by all sections of society in other countries, including even the Socialists, that it was necessary for every man to go through a certain amount of training, and our greatest soldier, Lord Roberts, who had spent practically the whole of his life in defending the British Empire in wars that had been forced upon us, although he was now at the age of seventy-four, when he certainly could claim to have earned a well-deserved rest, was occupying the last years of his life in going about and telling the people of this country that it was absolutely necessary for their safety that we should have universal military training; and, he told them that unless we did have it we should certainly drift into hopeless disaster. Lord Roberts said—

> "For the sake of all they held dear let our people bring home to themselves, what would be their position if Great Britain lost her power, her wealth and her Colonies."

The warning was given with the plain directness of a great soldier, and was surely a warning that we had no excuse for neglecting. The last time that a great fleet set forth to invade our shores, when it came in sight fires were lit on all the great hills of Britain, and in the country all the men, and he believed all the women, were ready, prepared and armed and willing, nay anxious, to defend their native land. He wished it was so now, and hoped it might be so before very long. We had, however, for so long a time been spared the horrors of having a foreign Power on our shores, that we were in great danger of forgetting the awful possibilities of it. It was very difficult indeed for the people of this nation to recognise that at one time during the Boer War this country was practically denuded of trained troops, and that both Lord Lansdowne and Sir E. Goldie had told us that this fact produced the most perilous international situation, and was full of peril to the Empire. Colonel Lonsdale Hale had told them that he had felt it his duty to tell both the civil and military authorities that at one time during the Boer War 50,000 picked troops of any of the great continental nations could have walked from one end of the country to the other. Were these the sort of risks we ought ever to run again, especially considering that the Boer War was really a small one compared with those which in all probability we should have to fight in the future? Let hon. Members just consider for a minute what their feelings would be if a foreign enemy got an entrance into the town in which they lived. He did not exaggerate when he said that if an enemy got into London it would mean, as the history of maritime nations of the past showed, and as Lord Salisbury had said, the end of the history of Britain. The Duke of Wellington left us a very strong warning in a letter to Sir John Burgoyne, in which he stated that from North Foreland to close to Portsmouth, infantry could be landed with very great ease, and if they had been landed, there were at least seven harbours where they could land their artillery and cavalry. Napoleon, Wellington and Moltke, all thought the invasion of this country practicable, and Lord Wolseley had given us even a stronger warning, and had told us what the plucky fishwives of the East of London would do with the War Minister and his colleagues if they caught them in Downing Street if Great Britain was ever caught napping and was invaded by an enemy. The leaders of the people of a great country not so far off by sea from here were telling their people that they must gain the supremacy of the sea, and that they must prepare for war with this country. That country had great ports where it could embark a great number of men at the same time. It had got 4,000,000 men who could be mobilised on a telegram from their Emperor. There was not the least doubt that but for our "wet ditch" it would be perfectly easy for that country to overrun and conquer us whenever they chose. If we were obliged to keep our ships tied to our shores it would be impossible to protect our food supply, and we should be starved into submission in a very short time. Those who believed in national defence had to contend with people who for generations had been taught to believe that the only thing that really mattered was to learn to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and who thought war could always be avoided by arbitration and universal disarmament. President Roosevelt had said that that was not possible; that it was not only most necessary to be prepared for war, but that it was disgraceful and cowardly to shirk war when national interests were involved. The hon. Member for Leicester had said that he did not believe in taxing people to preserve their country; and Socialists contended that the minds of the children in the schools must not be poisoned by their being taught to shoot. British Socialists believed that they would be able to prevent a war between Germany and England. The German Socialists on the other hand said quite plainly that Germany must be armed to the teeth and have a strong Navy. No country had been able to preserve its power, position and wealth whose sons had not taken the trouble to learn enough to be able to defend their country. History was full of examples of nations who had neglected this and who had gone down in consequence. The Dutch were a case in point. The Dutch of the Netherlands about the middle of the seventeenth century had a great mercantile marine and a great colonial empire and were in a position very like our own to-day. They depended on the sea for their food. They were the workshop of the world and were the greatest banking centre. They thought peace was their greatest interest, and trusted to alliances and their wealth, which they thought could buy armies to fight their battles, with the inevitable result that stronger nations conquered them and took their wealth and colonial possessions. Nations had not changed since those days. Nations still acted on the principle of the old lines—

> The good old rule, the simple plan,
> That they shall take who have the power
> And they shall keep who can.

As Moltke said—

> "It was only the sword that kept the sword in its scabbard. We gained our Empire and position by the sword, and by the sword we must keep it."

We must take the world as it really was, not as we thought it ought to be. When we became so civilised that a little man could hit a big one over the head and the big man would thank him and not attempt to retaliate, we could begin to talk of disarmament. At the present time, at all events, all history taught us that peace was only an interval between great wars, and the longer we enjoyed peace, the nearer we were to the next great war. We should, therefore, remember the great disasters that had overtaken other great nations, and prepare while there was yet time. Commercially-bred and commercially minded amiable people, who could not bear the idea that they, or any of those dear to them, should have to run the risk of being obliged to fight, tried to make us believe that war was always unnecessary, and could always be avoided, and in that way they prevented preparations for war, and so in reality did a great deal to make war much more likely. That sort of people objected to war because it would interfere with their comfort, and diminish their trade. The real remedy if we wanted to keep peace was simple. The children in our elementary and other schools should be taught British history and patriotism, the size and advantages of the British Empire, and that as their gallant ancestors, both men and women, risked, and often lost their lives, and endured great sacrifices to secure the Empire for them, so it was their bounden duty to be ready to fight for and preserve it for the future generations of the British race. It was also necessary for our safety that every man, rich and poor alike, should go through four months of continuous military training. That was not conscription or anything like it, and it had this great advantage, that it would improve the morale and physique of the nation and also increase our industrial efficiency. He thought an appeal should especially be made to the women of the British race. It was surely the duty of all men to learn enough to be able to defend their country, and was it not also the duty of women to see that the men did not shirk their duty? If we could get the women of Britain to understand the absolute necessity of universal military training for their own and their country's safety, he felt sure they would have Cabinet Ministers and politicians of all sorts tumbling over each other in their anxiety to bring in a Bill for that purpose. It was only a short time ago in a letter to the *Morning Post* that a woman said that women should take up miniature rifle shooting to encourage the men, and in reply to a question as to what would happen if the men did not take it up, she said that women should learn military drill so that in time of national peril they might be able to defend their homes, their children, their country and their men. When the next great war came, as come it certainly would, unless the nation was trained to arms, our women would see the trains or ships fading slowly out of their sight, carrying all they held most dear among the troops to the front, and many of them would know that for months their sons would be mere targets for the enemy, with no knowledge of how to defend themselves in modern war. So it was in the South African War, and so it was bound to be again unless the nation was roused from its fatal apathy, and our men recognised their responsibilies. Surely we should all try to put an end to our present defenceless state. It was well within the power of women alone to bring it about that there should not be a British mother in these islands who would not be proud that her sons were willing and able to defend their country in time of peril, and not a boy or girl who would not point the finger of scorn at any lad who shirked his first duty to his native land.

*Mr. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) said the point to which he wished to address himself was that there was no necessity for this Bill as no great danger confronted us. It was said that the Bill was not likely to lead to conscription, but to his mind it made conscription very easy. The one great danger to the peace of the world was the Press. If the Press of this country could for a few months be muzzled and prevented from making irritating abominable statements from day to day there would be no danger of any attempt being made to invade the country. He was not sure that the time was not approaching when the same law would have to be applied to the writers of inflammatory articles in the Press that was applied to people who incited others to break the peace and commit murder. In March 1905 the late Prime Minister in answer to a question by Colonel Welby, as to whether there was any danger of this country being invaded, said, as Chairman of the Defence Committee, that they were clearly of opinion that invasion of these islands in such force as to inflict a fatal blow or to threaten our independence was impossible. He added that the considerations which it seemed to the Committee of Defence ought to govern the number of troops to be maintained, depended on the claims which Colonial and still more Indian needs might make on our military system. The words of the late Prime Minister on the question of invasion were very emphatic. They had also the declaration upon the subject of the right hon. Gentleman who was Minister of Education last year, when he was severely heckled in regard to the introduction and teaching of rifle shooting in elementary schools. On 29th March of last year he himself asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he considered this instruction necessary for national defence, and whether there was any new danger confronting the country which rendered necessary increased preparation for war. The right hon. Gentleman replied that he did not regard rifle shooting in elementary schools as necessary to physical training, and he did not consider it necessary for the purposes of national defence; he was not aware of any danger threatening the country. That was another emphatic declaration added to that of the late Prime Minister, who, as Chairman of the Defence Committee, had access to all expert information, and knew well what he was talking about. There was no danger of invasion, and there was no necessity for this Bill. He was trying to take a common sense view of the question, and he was not to be frightened by any spectre of invasion. Five years ago this country was practically denuded of troops during the South African War, and then, if at any time, was the opportunity for an invasion of these shores; yet there was no manifestation of any desire either on the Continent or anywhere throughout the world to take advantage of our defenceless condition. It should also be borne in mind that we were at that time the best hated country in the world. He had at that time received letters from friends in many parts of Europe which showed the state of feeling on the Continent against us; and the last time the late Lord Pauncefote was on a visit to this country, and after he had travelled on the Continent, he almost shed tears in describing to him (Mr. Cremer) the state of opinion against us which he found everywhere on the Continent, and the hatred that prevailed against this country in consequence of the action we were taking in South Africa. At that time our only ally was the Sultan; the French Press was almost unanimously against us, he only knew of one exception, and in that instance the proprietor had to come over to this country to raise funds to continue the one journal which supported the British Government in its action in South Africa. That was the state of feeling abroad, and that was our defenceless condition at home, yet there was no attempt at an invasion of these shores, and such an opportunity was never likely to occur again. Since then Russia had fallen to the position of a third-rate Power, her fleet had been destroyed, and her internal dissensions rendered it practically impossible that she could take any active steps to attempt an invasion of this country. Yet not many years ago the Russian bogey was trotted out to frighten us into complying with demands for a stronger Navy and a stronger Army. Was there any danger to be apprehended from France? The changed relations between this country and France was the most remarkable, he believed, to be found anywhere in history. Thirty-five years ago, when they began their agitation for international arbitration, they were laughed to scorn, yet they could proudly say now that these two countries, England and France, who for generations had been engaged in fighting each other, had concluded a treaty of arbitration. That treaty was followed by a Convention, partly appointed by our Government and partly by the French Government, with a view to healing the old sores which had been running between the two countries for generations. The Convention met, and succeeded in achieving that object, because there was a desire to do so. An agreement was drafted and submitted to that House about three years ago.

The Jingoes in the House, when the agreement was presented for ratification, shrugged their shoulders and said: "Yes; those Frenchmen have got the best of us, and for the future we shall have to play second fiddle," but they did not divide the House. In the French Parliament, the Chauvinists also shrugged their shoulders and said: "Yes; John Bull has got the best of us and we shall have to play second fiddle," but they did not divide the Chamber or Senate. And since the date of that Convention there had not been a cloud on the horizon between this country and France. The French bogey had been laid like the Russian bogey. Never was there a time when our foreign relations were so friendly as they were to-day. And yet this was the time when an attempt was made to Germanise our Army. For these reasons he had decided to give the Bill his determined opposition. The pioneers of arbitration treaties had always contended that if any two nations would take the initiative in concluding such treaties their example would be followed by other nations and that contention had been fully justified. There were already eleven treaties of arbitration to which this country was committed, and which had been concluded since the first treaty was made between France and England. No less than twenty such treaties had also been concluded by civilised Powers, and this country had been parties to eleven of them. That was a great point gained, and he commended it to those who believed that man was a fighting animal, and that the old state of things would go on until the end of time. He had visited other countries and he knew something of their opinion upon the subject of invasion, and he did not believe that any country entertained the slightest intention of invading us. Was there any danger of the employment of the Italian Fleet to invade our shores? We were now on excellent terms of friendship with the Government of Italy, who was one of our most faithful allies. Was there an hon. Member in the House of Commons who did not believe that if there was any danger of this country being annihilated one of the first Powers to come to our rescue would be Italy? Italy was grateful to this country for what we did for her during her hour of trial and for helping to build her up into a great nation. Spain was also one of our allies. Austria had quite enough to do to hold together the various races which composed that heterogeneous Empire. Therefore there was no danger to be apprehended from Italy, Spain, or Austria. As regarded the Scandinavian States the best possible feeling existed towards this country. The United States were also upon the best possible terms with us, and if anyone was to get up at a meeting in the United States and talk about a war with England or an invasion of this country by the United States he would be laughed to scorn. Therefore there was not the slightest danger to be apprehended from any of the Powers to which he had referred. It was quite true that there was one solitary Power concerning which some misgivings were entertained, but that Power said exactly of this country what we said of them. They had a Press of the same type and character as we had, and if the German Press and some of the English Press were muzzled for a few months the feeling of anger would die out, and very little would be heard of the danger of England attacking Germany or of the Germans attacking us. Did any man in his senses believe that there was any real danger to be entertained because of the feeling of enmity which had been stirred up and fanned by the Press of the two countries? He happened to know something about the opinion of the people of Germany, and from his own experience he was satisfied that no people entertained more friendly feelings and sentiments towards English men than the Germans. If an attack was made upon this country by the Emperor of Germany, or even if he dreamt of such a thing, so friendly were the German people towards us that he believed they would repudiate any such design or intention. That was at any rate his own experience amongst the people of Germany. He would like the promoters of this Bill to tell him what was the danger they apprehended, and where it was likely to come from? Where was the enemy that had manifested the slightest desire to attack this country or invade our shores? He hoped in the reply which the Minister for War would presently deliver he would be good enough to tell them whether he was of the same opinion as the late Prime Minister and one of his own colleagues whose opinion he had already quoted, or whether he could prove that there was any real danger which necessitated the establishment of an Army on the lines laid down in this measure. It had been said that man was a fighting animal. He did not know whether that was the opinion of the Minister for War, but it was a favourite dogma with some people who opposed them when they tried to get arbitration substituted for war. It was possible that there was a good deal of the animal in their nature when they first came into the world, but those who claimed that man was a fighting animal should do their best from birth upwards to subdue the animal, and develop the moral and intellectual sides of their characters. He believed that this Bill would not do that, but develop and increase the fighting instinct, and that was sufficient reason for him to oppose its passage into law. Then there was the proposal for assisting and fostering cadet corps. He thought that the danger of that proposal was fairly well pointed out by the hon. Member for Leicester. If however, the Bill reached the Committee Stage he would move to omit those dangerous clauses. He was exceedingly sorry that the Secretary of State for War had thought necessary in this Bill to give aid and encouragement to institutions which up to the present had been purely voluntary in their character. Some of them for years had protested against the growth of militarism in our elementary schools. In the first place they protested against the introduction of the drill sergeant because they did not believe that it ought to be the object of education to encourage fighting. He well remembered the specious statement made at the time when the drill sergeant was introduced into schools and how military drill was defended on the ground that it set the children up and made them more obedient; but he believed that it was calculated to make children not obedient and independent, but subservient, and what they wished to see developed was manliness and independence, not subserviency. If they desired to see the result of militarism let them go to Germany. He was afraid that the frequent visits of the War Minister to Germany and the military system which prevailed there had influenced him in drafting this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman was a gentleman of very great ability, with the best possible intentions, but he was afraid he had gone astray and had allowed himself to be influenced by military rather than higher and nobler motives. There had been a great deal of contention in that House during the last two or three years upon the question of education and the teaching of religion in our elementary schools. Side by side with that there were a number of hon. Members who believed that the drill sergeant ought to have a place in their elementary schools. They believed that the drill sergeant should follow in the footsteps of the schoolmaster. If that was done the schoolmaster would, in giving religious instruction in the morning, teach the children to love their enemies, and in the afternoon they would be taken in hand by the drill sergeant, who would teach them how to shoot them. The paradox of teaching children in the morning to love their enemies and in the afternoon to shoot them was one of those things which he could not understand or reconcile.

MR. HUNT said they would only shoot when attacked.

*MR. CREMER said he apprehended a great deal of danger from the development of this fighting instinct. He would read to the House an instance of what he meant. In one of the Wiltshire villages, at an annual dinner, in responding to the toast of "The Volunteers," the speaker—a Volunteer—said, "Perpetual target practice was so dull that they sometimes felt they would like for a change to put a bullet through a human being." The danger was that this instinct begun in the schools would be continued and developed in the cadet corps and rifle corps. Up to the present time cadet corps had been purely voluntary, but if these two clauses were retained in the Bill they would receive official sanction. He sincerely hoped that when they came to the discussion of the clauses the Minister for War would consent to their omission. He opposed the Bill because he believed it was an attempt to Germanise the British Army. It would be a sad day for the liberties of this country if militarism in any thing like the form in which it was to be found in Germany were introduced. He also opposed the Bill because he believed it to be absolutely unnecessary, there being no danger to be confronted. He further opposed it because he believed it was calculated to develop the fighting instinct among the people of this country. It was an attempt to militarise our institutions, a thing against which he and some of his friends had been protesting for a good many years. He believed it was the duty of the State to cultivate, not the destructive, but the constructive, side of our natures. For these reasons he was exceedingly sorry to find himself in the painful position of having to decide between loyalty to Party and duty to conscience, but on this occasion he could not strain his conscience to the breaking point, and consequently he would be impelled to enter the division lobby in opposition to the Bill.

Mr. D. DAVIES (Montgomeryshire) said he had seen with regret an attempt to knock the bottom out of the Bill and at the same time the determination to reject any solution on a compulsory basis. What then was wanted? They would be extremely glad to know what remedy it was proposed to apply to the present position of the Forces of the country. It appeared to him that the present Bill brought a new principle into operation and made a new departure which no other War Minister had ever attempted in the course of our history. It brought the Volunteer Forces into direct contact with the people as a whole. It must necessarily force the onus of responsibility on the local authorities themselves. One hon. Member had told him that the Volunteers were either overloaded with praise they did not deserve or looked down upon and every obstacle placed in their way. That to a great extent was very true. The other day he was at a Volunteer dinner where one of the persons present alluded to the Volunteers in the most eulogistic terms, yet the following week he prevented several of his employees from joining a Volunteer corps. There were a good many people in the country who adopted a similar attitude. Once they impressed on the local authorities their responsibility the attitude towards the Volunteers would be very different. The position of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London seemed to be somewhat incomprehensible. So far as he himself was concerned he spoke from several years experience as a Volunteer. He believed that in adopting the county as a unit they would call forth patriotism and *esprit de corps* and bring in usefully a certain amount of friendly rivalry among the counties themselves. He thought this scheme would introduce a great deal of the public spirit to which the Foreign Secretary had alluded in his speech when referring to the organisation and general tone of the Volunteers. With regard to cadet corps and rifle clubs, a good many Members on that side of the House had taken serious objection to the proposal to give them support. Again he would like to refer to what fell from the hon. Member for the Woodstock division when he told the House that it was very difficult to get men who came up from a public school or a university to join the Volunteers, because they had done a certain amount of drill in their schools. The hon. Member for Shoreditch had said that this system in the public schools introduced militarism into the country. Both those statements could not be correct. He had served in a cadet corps in a school where service was compulsory. He believed in the system of military exercises in the schools throughout the country. Men spent a great deal of their time at games and there was great indirect benefit from that in the way of moral training. The system of military training in the schools had already been tried with great success in our Colonies and in Japan. He believed that a great deal of the success of Japan in the recent war was due to the military training given in the elementary and secondary schools which had been introduced in that country. He strongly hoped that the Minister for War would not strike out that portion of the Bill but rather strengthen it and make it more efficient.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he ventured to offer a few words as an old Volunteer and one who had served in more portions than one of the Empire. The hon. Member for Shoreditch had given expression to laudable aspirations for universal peace. They did not share his confidence and belief that the time of peace was at hand. The hon. Member was on dangerous ground when he quoted scripture in support of his contention, because passages could be quoted on the other side. Shakespeare said—

> "The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose."

He was not entirely in accord with some of his fellow Members on that side of the House. He strongly welcomed what he believed to be the great effort of his right hon. friend to bring the military service of the country into something like harmony. In the last Parliament a number of them did their best to get successive Secretaries for War to raise the position and *status* of the Volunteers, but they were not very successful. They had asked for the raising of the *status* of the Volunteers; the right hon. Gentleman had attempted to raise it. They had asked for the better equipment of the Regular Army; the right hon. Gentleman had attempted to give it. He did not know whether his attempt to give the Artillery equipment to the Volunteer service had been sufficiently successful. They had asked that the financial responsibility should be taken away from commanding officers of the Auxiliary Army; that would be secured. They had asked for training with the Regular Army in the manœuvres; that had been granted by the late Secretary of State for War, and was to be continued. They had asked for greater facilities for rifle practice; they were to be granted. They had asked that the Auxiliary Forces should be put under a separate department at the War Office, which should have closer knowledge of their needs; but that separate department was not to be granted. They believed that with the development of the Volunteer service reductions in the Regular Army might be safely made. [OPPOSITION cries of dissent.] He knew that some of his hon. friends did not agree with him on that point; but he hoped they would allow him to state his case. He would never give his support to any scheme which suggested a reduction of the Regular Army if it did not also increase the efficiency of the Voluntary Army; but that would involve what the right hon. Gentleman had not given, increased expenditure on the Volunteer Forces. The reductions in the Regular Army would have given the right hon. Gentleman an extra £1,600,000 for the Volunteer Army, and he believed that the right hon. Gentleman had erred in not increasing the grants to the Volunteer Army. The right hon. Gentleman wanted an efficient but cheap Army, and a great many of his friends wanted a cheap and a small Army. The two things were incompatible unless the Volunteer Army was developed as it had not yet been developed in this country. The basis of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme was uniformity. The Militia, as he understood it, were to be incorporated into the Territorial Army, they were to pass through exactly the same training and receive the same pay as the Volunteers. Some hon. Members believed that the Militia were going to receive some training of their own. That, he thought, was a fundamental error. The right hon. Gentleman believed that with our peculiar conditions of society he could suddenly change those natural gradations which had drawn from different classes in this country men to join the Militia, the Volunteers, the Yeomanry, and the Regular Army. He was very much afraid that the right hon. Gentleman had been moved by two considerations; first, the consideration of what conscription had done in other countries; and, secondly, the belief that this was a democratic England, and that a democratic England should have a democratic Army. The right hon. Gentleman proposed two lines. The first one to go into barracks and be trained to serve abroad; and the second line was to serve for a certain period every year for a soldier's pay. But he did not think that the right hon. Gentleman's proposal would be so effective or economical as in the United States

There and in our Colonies they had no great public schools as in England. So far as education was concerned all classes met on the same grounds. The sons of the rich man and of the poor man went to the same school, and it was possible to get a democratic element in the education of the youth for the defence of their country. Whatever the future might bring forth, and whatever the apirations of the hon. Member for Leicester and his friends might be, there was a long road to travel before the different classes in England could be brought into one line in relation to the Army. The right hon. Gentleman's scheme wholly depended for its success upon the Special Contingent. He could not send into the field in time of war the number of men he had promised for an expeditionary force unless he had the Special Contingent. But the Special Contingent competed with the Volunteers and the Militia. He did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman could get the same kind of men to go into the Volunteers and into the Militia. There was something in the tradition and the history of the Militia and its drilling in battalions which drew into it, not only the corner boys, and men out of work, but a considerable section of the community who liked the old constitutional force, and who were prepared, if necessary, to go from the Militia to the Regulars. He asked the right hon. Gentleman if he thought that he could get men for the Special Contingent who could only drill in squads, which had no regimental prestige, and had nothing of the attractiveness which surrounded battalion co-operation? He believed that the right hon. Gentleman would find that instead of getting his full complement for the Special Contingent, he would only get those who were out of work and were driven to the last extremity. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman was running a great risk. He believed the Secretary of State would have been more successful if he had applied the county association scheme to the Militia, and thus revived the old county feeling which had subsisted for more than a century. Later on he might have applied the county association scheme to the Volunteers. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division had said that compulsory service such as existed in Switzerland would be anti-pathetic to the will of the people of this country; but when the Ballot Act for the Militia was in force it was not necessary to apply it, for it was found that for every Volunteer asked for to serve abroad three were ready to offer themselves. He sympathised in the strongest fashion with the attempt which the right hon. Gentleman had made to give us a nation in arms, and if he failed no one would regret it more than he.

MR. HALDANE: I am grateful to the hon. Member who has just sat down for the tone of his speech. With all his criticism I am not in agreement, but his desire has been most genuinely and most obviously to bring to bear the best light he could on the extremely difficult problem with which we have to deal, and to help and not to hinder those who are responsible for its elaboration. I think I may go further, and say his speech has been perhaps typical in an extreme degree of the good temper and tone with which this debate has been conducted. Certainly no Minister has ever had the same cause to thank the House of Commons for the gracious reception of proposals about which, even when his opponents have not agreed, they have spoken with obvious earnestness and sincerity. There is one feature which has characterised the whole debate in a striking fashion. We have had many opinions put forward. One might almost say *quot homines, tot sententiæ*. Hardly any Member who has spoken has been in entire agreement with another. Many on this side of the House, while in agreement with the general principle, have demurred to particular details, and not the same details. On the other side there have been many who disagreed with the structure of the plan, but who agreed with many of the details, though not always the same details. What is the result of that? The result is that, notwithstanding what is called the reasoned Amendment which has been put down to the Second Reading, we have had no plan and no proposition from the other side to take the place of the one before the House. This plan holds the field. I say that with the more emphasis because in the Amendment, which is the official Amendment from the

Opposition benches, if there is a plan foreshadowed—and I think there is one—it is not a plan which either accords with the opinions which have been expressed in the course of this debate or is in accordance with the traditions of the Party opposite. What is the substance of the Amendment? It is this. Organise not in two lines but in three; leave the Volunteers and the Militia and the Yeomanry on the present principle, improve them simply, and take that existing fashion of organisation as sufficient. But is that plan consistent with what was put before the House—and put before the House on behalf of the then Government—by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon? Why, Sir, the plan which was the plan of the Opposition when they sat upon this side of the House was a plan more sweeping in this direction than anything I put forward. It proposed, as regards the Regulars, to reduce not eight battalions, as I have done, in addition to the two of Guards, but fourteen battalions of the Line, including those very battalions with which it has been my duty to deal. It proposed to take the Militia and cut down many of their *cadres*—to convert them into something quite different from what they are now; it proposed to revolutionise the system of the Regular Army. It was a proposition which, I think, under different circumstances, and given men and money, neither of which, I think, were present in sufficient quantities to give the plan a practical possibility of success, would have had much to be said for it; but it was wholly inconsistent not only with the official Amendment that we have here, but with what was foreshadowed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin. In that state of things is the Opposition justified in pressing an Amendment to a proposal such as this? You may say, and you have said, that you put your finger upon various defects, as you consider them, of a serious character in the scheme; and both the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin and the right hon. Member the Leader of the Opposition gave us most fairly and fully reasoned accounts of the defects which they considered to be inherent in the plan. But, after all, there is something more that you have got to consider before you can justly, I think, press an Amendment such as this to a scheme which, say what you will about it, has, as you all agree, a good many things which give it an advantage over the present state of affairs—I am putting it at its lowest—and which has the Army Council and the Defence Committee at its back. After all, the plan which has been put forward rests upon the best thought and the best consideration that we can give it; and is the situation with which you have got to deal one which leaves you at liberty to go on without some attempt at drastic reform? I ask whether the situation, either as regards the Regular Army or as regards the Auxiliary Forces, is one which renders a continuance of the present state of things tolerable? The right hon. Gentlemen opposite thought not; they have produced in the last ten years two plans for changing that state of things; we have produced a third, and I think we have all been right. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon was absolutely justified in his criticism upon the existing state of things. When, on the introduction of this Bill, and in still more detail upon the Estimates, I put forward the reasons why we felt we were compelled to deal with the condition of the Regular Forces, I pointed out—and the facts which I gave were not controverted, and they could not be controverted—that our first line is full of gaps, that it is deficient in supports, and above all in provision to make up for the wastage of war. Full of gaps how? I merely mention the artillery in passing; it is not the most serious of all the cases. I have always thought that when you were passing from one kind of artillery to another—to a very quick-firing gun—it would be not unnatural that you should find yourself short in ammunition guns. And I only dwelt, earlier in these discussions, upon the gap in the artillery for this reason, that I have been myself attacked about artillery, and I pointed out that the reason why I was moving in the matter about artillery was because I had a very serious situation confronting me. It was this—that no more than forty-two batteries could be mobilised because of the amount of ammunition which these guns used. Well, Sir, I hope still to get sufficient men to mobilise the full complement of batteries—seventy-two, I think the number is—which we could find for the force, calculating its complete organisation. I hope that we shall be able to get a large number of men at any rate for the divisional ammunition guns. When that is done, and as that is done, I hope to replace the Regulars by Militia-trained men for that purpose. But not one man has been taken off the fighting men of the batteries of the Regular artillery up to this time. If we succeed we shall be able to do it, and we shall be able to keep the batteries manned with people who are trained up to that high point which, I agree, is absolutely necessary if your artillery is to be on a high level. I think the House listened with pleasure to the graphic description of my hon. friend the Member for Salford, to the most interesting and vivid account that he gave, with all the fire of one who had been trained up himself with the French artillery, of the battle of Saint Privat. I think we all feel the necessity of that high training if you are to have an ideal state of things in your artillery, and Heaven forbid that I or any other Ministers should cut down that as regards the fighting Army. But it is not that with which I am trying to deal. Our artillery stands as an illustration of the old fashion in which we try to do what no other nation does—to put every form of service, artillery and everything else, upon the highest professional footing. You will never get a sufficiency of men, because you have not a sufficiency of money to do it, if you take everybody for every service at that high level, irrespective of the extent and of what the service is. If you can fill your divisional ammunition columns with men of a lower degree of training, and if you can do something more with your brigade ammunition columns, then you will be able not only to fill up the gap that exists at the present time, but you will have your artillery not only as efficient, but more efficient than it is at the present time, certainly for not more money than you at present spend. That is in course of consideration, in course of being worked out. It is very difficult. There are many problems in connection with it, and I do not intend, speaking as a responsible Minister, to take action until they are carefully worked out. That is why I have not yet effected the reduction of a single man in the fighting element in the batteries of artillery. The garrison artillery is another question. What I am talking about is the horse and field artillery. When I come to other parts of the Line the defects are more serious. The Army Service Corps, transport, supply, all the various items which are essential to the Army are wanting. and, above all, that element which is necessary to make up the wastage of war by sending drafts. We have not got that. Our first line is in a seriously defective condition, and my proposition to the House of Commons is that the first duty of a War Minister is to see to the first line and to get it into a perfect condition. When you come to the working out of that, how do you stand? The Leader of the Opposition expressed a real regret that we had not been able to keep the Militia in their present form. I do not admit that we are destroying the Militia. We are destroying an antiquated organisation, but the Militia itself, the really historical Militia, not only are we not destroying them, but we are proposing to return to their original form. Until Mr. Pitt began to drain the Militia for the purposes of the Line, the Militia were a county force, recruited in the counties and of a local character. They ceased to be that. Why? Because they had become a mere adjunct of the Line, and because they were more and more ruthlessly used by the Line. What has been the result? The Militia have been going down and down the hill. They are between 30,000 and 40,000 short of their establishment, they are nearly 1,000 short of officers, and their condition is getting worse than before. Their organisation is antiquated and not up to the level of the time, and nothing but a revolution in their condition can put them back into a position which would justify the expenditure of such a large sum as is expended upon them every year. What we propose with the Militia is this. Put shortly, we say that the Militia contains two elements—the professional element, which has grown up more and more until they have become associated with the Line, and made them what they have been since 1882, completely under the War Office, and what we may call their original, historical, county element which belongs to them, which distinguishes the *cadres*, and which is there notwithstanding the extent to which they have been used for drafts. At the present time the Line is dependent on the Militia. It takes 12,000 men every year as recruits from the Militia force. It has to rely upon them for drafts—it has got absolutely nothing else to rely on to make up the wastage of war. Why is it necessary, for the purpose of assisting the Line, to deal with the Militia as we propose? There are two reasons. For the first, the right hon. Gentleman opposite has been a little responsible. In 1902 the right hon. Gentleman abolished the Militia Reserve, in which a large number of men took an engagement by which they were ready to go abroad as drafts of the Line, and most valuable they were in the South African war. But soon after the war, the Government with which the right hon. Gentleman was connected, abolished the Militia Reserve. They had the new short service arrangement, and they thought the three years system would give them not only a large Reserve but plenty of drafts. The drafts part of the scheme failed altogether, and the result was that the Regular Line was left in a condition far worse than it was before, because it had no longer the Militia to look to. It has been suggested that the present situation is the outcome of some temporary quarrel between the Militia and the War Office—that if we had been more tactful and conciliatory on both sides we might have got an arrangement by which the Militia would have been kept intact. That is not so. The situation is the outcome of prolonged discussions between the Militia commanding officers and ourselves. I have in this box a document signed by commanding officers that expresses their considered view after careful reflection. They say, "We are unwilling to furnish drafts for the Line, and we decline to do so." Some of them were willing to furnish drafts in companies; but of all the commanding officers of Militia, only four would consent to that course. The vast majority said that neither in individuals nor in companies would they furnish drafts to the Line, because they would ruin their corps if they did. I do not blame them for that course. Their *cadres* were getting smaller and smaller, and the situation was worse than it looked because of the habit of the Militia of taking recruits under eighteen years of age, and because, by reason of their bad organisation, the same man was often serving in several *cadres*. Their real strength was much below their nominal strength. The Militia were right in saying, "We won't give you drafts," and we were right in saying, "We must have drafts." The Militia is not a toy kept up for nothing. We spend £2,000,000 a year on it, and we must get the best value we can for our money. The best value was to make the Line as perfect as possible; and to do that, to take the professional substance of the Militia—the men who are not recruited locally—and assign them a definite duty. In military matters, as in others, there is no greater abuse than giving a man two functions. You cannot make him a Militiaman and a draft at the same time. If you do, you damage the *cadre*, and you will not have efficient machinery for supplying drafts. Therefore, we hit upon the plan, which has very strong grounds to commend it, of the third battalion, which is to be a training school for drafts and to take the professional substance of the Militia, and to furnish those corps in the form of drafts for the Line, willing to go abroad. The Militia *cadre* will go back to the county, and it will there take the recruit of a local character. But I do not wish that it should go forth that that course precludes the Militia in the counties from taking the new kind of recruit—that it shuts them out from a higher form of training than the mere eight or fifteen days of the ordinary recruit. It is a question of experiment and money. If experience shows that you can get men who are willing to take one month's recruit training, it will be a question for Parliament to decide whether it is worth while to spend the money in giving local recruits, if they come up, the sort of training which will bring them up to a higher level than that attainable by the recruits in the ordinary Territorial Army. But that should not be an exclusively Militia privilege; it should be extended to the entire Territorial Army. You may find that this Army is your strength and your backbone in the future; that, owing to changes in policy and circumstances, your expeditionary force need not be so large; and nothing is more likely to give you security in that conviction than to make the Territorial Force as real as possible. Therefore Parliament may wish to extend the training of the Militia battalions which will be territorial battalions at that time, with such troops as can be got for that purpose in the country; but experience alone can determine the question, and it is looking too far ahead for me to pronounce on it or make any proposition at the present moment. I only wish to point out that there is opened out opportunity for far higher training than would appear under the modest conditions of the Bill. I wish to say another thing. There is a class connected with the Militia with whom I have a great amount of sympathy, and that is, not the county officers, but the almost professional Militia officers who devote a great deal of time to giving training to Militia recruits and battalions. One would wish to make provision for them. If a Militia battalion with that class of officers says "We do not wish to go into the county, but would like to continue on a more professional footing," it is open to them to enlist individually, not as a *cadre*, into the third battalions of their territorial regiments. In that way we shall get our drafts; because they will undertake to go abroad, and their officers will go into the Reserve of Officers and get as good employment as at present. In that fashion, combined with the assistance that they would have from the Regular officers, working with them at the depots, there would be a sphere for the Militia officer and for the Militiaman much more real than any open to them at present. It has been said that, after all, the Militia battalions, weakened though they were, did go abroad and occupy foreign stations. I have pointed out that these third battalions on mobilisation might take a large number of the surplus recruits from the Reservists, and from the number of those people who always come in on the wave of enthusiasm at the outbreak of a great war. They will then throw off composite battalions, and we have provided for that possibility by having a number of Regular officers, Regular captains, who will be assigned to each of these battalions, and will be taken, of course, from the Reserve of Officers, who will come in if wanted. In that way we have substituted material from which no doubt we will get a certain number of composite battalions, I cannot say how many, to go abroad for the particular purposes for which the Militia were maintained. You do not want a great many of these battalions. We have got two Regular battalions on the lines of communication, but in addition we have provided twelve extra Militia battalions for this very purpose. In Ireland there are no Volunteers; and we think, therefore, we have a right to make special provision in the case of the Irish Militia. Each of the territorial battalions in Ireland will have its third battalion behind it, but the Irish Militia, which remains a Militia, we hope to consolidate into twelve good battalions to enlist under Part III., so as to be available for service abroad. They will be Regular battalions and not merely training schools for drafts. They will be Regular battalions; I do not care to call them Militia, because they come under the new provisions; they will be available to send abroad with their officers and will be able to undertake the duties which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin referred to. I now come to the Yeomanry. I have, of course, the greatest sympathy for the case which has been made out for the Yeomanry. Why have we been compelled to insist upon the necessity for a change in the force? It has not been done lightly. It has been done after the closest consultation with the General Staff. It has been done because we are convinced that, if there is to be a real military organisation in this country, it must be on two lines, and that the second line must be as nearly as possible of the pattern of the first line. Without that, we are certain that you cannot get either the just proportion of combined arms, or that sort of training, or that sort of spirit which is essential if our Auxiliary Forces are to be a reality. I have been a great deal among them; and I find that what they most desire is to be made efficient and to be taken seriously. Volunteers in every part of the country have said to me—

> "Do not be afraid to put duties on us if you will only make us efficient."

I am convinced that the way to make them efficient is to give them an organisation as nearly alike as possible to the organisation of the first Line, and to ascribe to them definite functions. The expeditionary force, with the Fleet which forms the complementary part of that force, are our first Line. The second or Territorial Line is this Territorial or Home Defence Force. I rejoice to think that, as will be seen in the newspapers to-morrow, the Colonial Premiers at the Conference have unanimously decided that this is the best pattern of organisation, and that just as we propose to organise the Territorial Force here for home defence, they propose to keep that pattern in view in the organisation of their home forces, so that we may have not merely 300,000 here, but a chain of Territorial Forces throughout the Empire which may give us some real security. I do not think that makes in the direction of militarism. I cannot agree with my hon. friend the Member for Haggerston whose sincerity I recognise, and whose services in the cause to which he has given his life we all appreciate. I feel that, in enabling the people to defend themselves, we are getting rid of that unrest and want of tranquillity which affords the greatest impulse towards compulsory service. I say that in our plan you have a bulwark against compulsory service. If you retain the present confused state of things it is impossible to predict what vicissitudes of political feeling or confusion in military affairs may bring about in the way of an impulse towards compulsory service. Therefore, we take our stand upon this Bill as a bulwark against compulsion; and we rejoice to find the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition is in accord with our view that the nation is not likely to turn to that remedy. I say, if we are to have any Army at all, let us have an Army fashioned in the interest of peace and tranquillity. But to return to the Yeomany. We have felt compelled to ask the Yeomanry to fit itself into this second Line organisation. That, of course, involves certain changes. It is impossible to justify the payment of the cavalry at one rate and the artillery and infantry at Army rates and, at the same time, retain to the Yeomanry their present rate of remuneration. But, while recognising that that cannot be done and about that we cannot give way, I quite feel the difficulty of the Yeomanry commanders in their desire to help us in any way they can in the unrest that the imposition of new conditions gives rise to. In the first place, then, every Yeomanry corps may go on enlisting men until this Bill becomes operative in that particular district, which probably will not be for twelve months, and the men enlisted may continue to serve for three years on the present terms; that will give them a transition period of three years. I have considered very much what has been pressed upon me from both sides of the House about the pay of the Territorial Force. I am very reluctant to start upon an extravagant footing, for I hold strongly to the doctrine that frugality is the foundation of efficiency in military matters, and that is the experience of the most efficient Continental forces, and it should be the beginning of wisdom with us. I do not want to cut down expenses too much, but I do not want to be extravagant. But we do feel it necessary to dissent wholly, the Government wholly dissent, from the suggestion put forward by the right hon. baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean in a speech which was characterised by a high capacity for making unpleasant suggestions as to the expense of the Territorial Force. He quoted the military correspondent of *The Times*, a great authority upon Army matters, and he spoke of the wisdom of the proposition that the force would require £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 to support it. Well, but what the military correspondent of *The Times* was speaking of was a suggestion of mine that he had before him in a speech I made in October. I have looked up the speech. He was speaking of a description given by myself of what might happen in a time of national peril when we might be driven to the length, in the emergency to which I referred, of keeping 700,000, 800,000, or 900,000 men in the field. The right hon. Gentleman said, truly enough, that to keep that force in the field would cost a great deal of money, and I daresay he was right in his suggestion that it would cost £7,000,000 or £8,000,000; I do not know. But I was speaking of an extremely exceptional and unlikely case, out of which we could not hope to get cheaply. But I propose a war strength of 300,000, and I doubt if, in time of peace, we should get to that; and estimates we put forward are not estimates that allow large cost for equipment, because this force will not grow up all at once, and men have walking dresses of some sort which we do not need to change all at once. We have not gone into that for it will be a gradual process of conversion, and we are dealing with people already equipped. The estimates we put forward were not "faked" estimates, but arrived at after careful calculations by the Financial Secretary and a competent staff of civilian assistants of the cost of keeping this Territorial Force in being. I believe they are calculated on a liberal scale, including salaries and a large allowance for horses. We have been pressed upon the question of allowance for rations and pay. What we propose is to give Army pay, and it has been said that the Army ration is worth about 6d., with a grocery allowance of 3d. That is said not to be enough to enable the Auxiliary Force representative to maintain himself in comfort. I am not sure about that, but, at any rate, we find that the Regular troops, when they come into camp, do have a little more from canteen funds and other sources. That justifies me in saying that in the case of the territorial men, without any violation of principle, we can make a certain camp allowance in place of the 3d.; and I trust the House will not think me departing from my generally frugal provision if I suggest that we should spend another £150,000 on the Estimate for the Territorial Force. We may have to go even £150,000 beyond that; but of this I am certain, the amount will not be large and will not do any particular damage to our automatic economies.

MR. WALTER LONG asked that the House should know precisely what were the terms before the Bill passed into Committee.

MR. HALDANE: I will undertake to manage that, either by distributing a supplementary document or in some other way, although I shudder at the prospect of distributing another document. But what we propose instead of the separate grocery allowance is to give a shilling camp allowance per man per day whilst in camp. That applies to the whole Territorial Force volunteering. The infantry as well as the cavalry and artillery, and especially the Volunteers, will not only be better off, but the officers will be substantially better off than at present. That I am quite sure can be done without extravagance. Rome was not built in a day. Neither will this Territorial Army be built in a day. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London put to me in a fashion which I admired for its conciseness, a question about the Army Reserve. I have got here the latest figures about the Army Reserve. At present it is at a total of 115,422. Our normal Reserve is 115,171. Why is it that sometimes the Reserve, according to the normal, and according to the actual strength, varies so? The reason is that the actual strength depends on varying and fluctuating considerations. They happen just now to coincide; but it is only the totals which coincide. For instance, I will take sections A. and B., including all arms. The normal strength is 89,986; the present strength is 98,585, so the actual strength is in excess there of my normal estimate. But what makes a difference is that section B. will, according to the normal, be 25,000, while at present it is only 16,800. The infantry of the line are 62,000 in sections A. and B., as compared with my normal 45,000. The other arms are just the other way. The right hon. Gentleman will see at once how difficult it is to challenge actuarial calculations. They may be wrong, but they represent the very best you can give, and the outcome of the whole matter is that the normal and actual at this moment apparently coincide, with the flunctuations of the character I have referred to. I come now to other points which have been rasied. There was, for instance, the question of Volunteer artillery. On that question I quite agree that you cannot hope to produce in the shape of Volunteer artillery anything like the effectiveness you get with the Regular artillery; but I do think that it is infinitely better to have trained Volunteer artillery — artillery trained as well as you can train them— than not to have them at all. After all, putting it at its worst, assuming that these guns would not be useful at the comparatively short ranges at which they would be most required in home operations—so the General Staff assure me—you have a large number of quick-firers in this country after the expeditionary force is taken out, you have the reserve guns and the training batteries. They will be there. You have got a lot of extra guns to which these skilled artisans, the people who make up the artillery, men who understand the technical work better than the trained artillery—these men will very soon knock into shape and be of real assistance, even if you only want them as drafts. I believe they will become competent artillerymen as part of the home defence force much quicker than you think, even though they may not come up to your ideal of perfection. If you want to know what training their men are willing to take up, ask some commanding officers, and they will say that they believe in Volunteer artillery, and that they have been able to bring their corps up to a considerable state of perfection. I think it is not only as part of the second line, but also for the sake of getting this trained element in the country, that it is worth while spending money and trouble in trying to bring up a force of Volunteer artillery such as the Volunteers have been asking for for some time past, and such as will form a real element in the second line. There was a brilliant speech by my hon. friend the Member for Leicester disagreeing with the plan of the Government and condemning it. He said many things deserving of attention, but I was unable to agree with the line he took on the various points he dealt with. He said the Volunteers are being put under half military conditions. The hon. Member I do not think realises that the provisions of this Bill reproduce with slight modifications the provisions of the model rules under which most of the Volunteer corps are. The condition of the Volunteers will certainly be no worse than under the corps rules at the present time. The period of enlistment, the terms of service, and so on represent very much what is the Volunteer practice at the present time. Then as regards martial law. It seems to be assumed that we are doing something new. But that is not the case. Moreover, it is not proposed to put the Volunteer under martial law in peace, but to bring him more, if he does offend, under the cognizance of the civil tribunal. In that respect, when we come to the Committee, I hope to be able to satisfy them that, so far from going back in this matter, we are going forward. Then there is the question of officers. It is suggested that we are shutting ourselves off from people who might rise from the ranks. We are not. There is a tremendous shortage of officers at the present time; we cannot get them from the ranks or anywhere else. We have been compelled to resort to other avenues for obtaining them. We are looking to the public schools and Universities. We have cadet corps and Volunteer corps in the Universities. That is what we have at the present time. There is plenty of military spirit there, and the more you try to put it down the more it will grow up. We shall do much better to let it take a useful shape. We look, then, upon this as a source from which we may fill up a gap which exists at the present time, but we shall be only too glad to see men rise from the ranks. At present the officer is very badly paid, though we are trying this year to make matters a little better in the case of battalion commanders; but do what you will, officers have to keep up a certain state—their own men would not tolerate them if they did not—and that means expenditure of money. Consequently it is difficult for a man to rise from the ranks to the position of officer. At the same time, we should like to create positions which would not involve that expenditure, so far as we can avoid it. We believe in taking every fit man you can find. Men have risen from the ranks to eminence before now, and it is through no desire to stop that process, but because we are face to face with an absolute shortage of officers, that we have taken the course we have. As I have said before, what we look to for making this second line is the fact that each man who enters it will engage in a great emergency, and it is only for a great emergency that this force is designed to undergo a further training, following on the previous training, to supervene on the outbreak of war. If that is done then we are advised and we believe that you will turn out men who month by month will be better and who will not only be able to defend the shores of their country, but—those of them who are willing—to go abroad to assist the Regular Army. That is to a great extent what we rely upon, and it is on that system, so designed and worked out, that we rest our hope of getting something like order in place of the chaos which exists at present. It is only so, that you will be able ultimately to get down the cost of the Army to a satisfactory figure. It is the wastage arising from want of organisation that is responsible for the heavy expenditure on the Army of which the people complain. In some respects there are things on which we can congratulate ourselves, and we must be thankful for such mercies as we have. I had before me to-day a calculation of the cost this year of the German Regular Army calculated upon our own basis, and it is over £46,000,000. We are fortunate in living in times when we are endeavouring to administer the Army as frugally as possible, and I hope effectually. This Bill comes up for consideration in its next stage in Committee, and the view of the Government is that it would probably be for the convenience of the House that this Bill should be treated as one of the kind that should be taken down stairs. That can only be if there is an understanding about time. We do not want to have to go on, if we can avoid it, in an autumn session. Therefore we feel it would be for the convenience of the House to have a time limit. I hope we shall be able to come to an agreement about that. We shall have the greatest desire to consult the convenience of hon. Gentlemen in all parts of the House, and to secure a sufficient and satisfactory discussion upon the large points of principle involved. Therefore, I propose, after the Second Reading, to move that the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House. In conclusion, let me say that I am quite aware that no Army scheme can hope to be ideal, or one against which it may not be possible to level criticisms that may be well founded. The whole subject is so intricate, the confusion is so vast, the subject-matter so extensive, that it is impossible to be sure you have reached the best solution. The plan which we propose is, on the whole, a modest plan. It is not ambitious, but it is a plan which we hope is a practical plan. We have done our best to hit upon an organisation which creates the least possible disturbance consistent with maintaining our first object—namely, to put our first Regular Line in a satisfactory state, and to introduce organisation in the Auxiliary Forces. It is in that spirit that we commend the Bill to the House, reciprocating the good-will shown by hon. Members in all parts of the House, and the general determination to try to make the best of this plan, whatever be its merits.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 388; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 139.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, HilaireJosephPeter R.
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, SirJ.H(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, RtHnSirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John

Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. HnSydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.HnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W. H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorEMartin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christohper
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmede, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras, E.)
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald

Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rahpael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtnay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (City Lond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(Bury S.Ed'm's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Hobert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel

Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Main Question proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the business:—

Whereupon Mr. SECRETARY HALDANE rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided; Ayes, 343; Noes, 31. (Division List, No. 140.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Bolfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmot (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir S. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt, Hn Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwwood, G. (Peterborough
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George

Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincain-Smith, Captain
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Phillip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sutherland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Alden, Percy
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Barnes, G. N.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cooper, G. J.
Cremer, William Randal
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Walsh, Stephen
Wilson, W.T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Arthur Henderson and Mr. George Roberts.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)

Adjourned at Twenty-nine minutes after Eleven o'Clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLXXII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Army Annual	*Earl of Portsmouth*	Read 2^a 16th April (732) Committee Report 17th April (935) Read 3^a and passed 22nd April (1364)
*Judicature [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 3^a and passed 23rd April (1542)
*Rule Committee [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2^a 23rd April (1538)
*Statute Law Revision	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2^a 23rd April (1534)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Advertisements Regulation	*Mr. Hart-Davies*	Read 2^o 22nd April (1532)
Blind (Technical Education, etc.)	*Mr. Steadman*	Read 1^o 11th April (393)
*Butter and Margarine	*Sir E. Strachey*	Second Reading (adjourned) 17th April (1056)
Coal Mines (Eight Hours)	*Mr. Walsh*	Read 2^o 12th April (501)
Convicts' Divorce	*Mr. Bottomley*	Read 1^o 18th April (1174)
*Court of Criminal Appeal	*Sir J. Walton*	Read 1^o 17th April (1008)
Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities (No. 2)	*Sir C. Dilke*	Read 1^o 9th April (83)
Harbour Authorities (Ireland	*Mr. J. Devlin*	Read 1^o 18th April (1175)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Home Work	*Mr. Barnes*	Read 1° 16th April (780)
Hours of Labour in Bakehouses	*Mr. Wilkie*	Second Reading (adjourned) 17th April (1099)
Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment	*Mr. Hogan*	Read 2° 19th April (1269)
Notification of Births	*Lord R. Cecil*	Read 1° 23rd April (1582)
Nurses and Private Nursing Homes Registration	*Mr. Claude Hay*	Read 1° 15th April (726)
Open Spaces (Scotland)	*Mr. McCrae*	Read 1° 11th April (393)
Parliamentary Voters Registration	*Mr. Cremer*	Read 1° 11th April (394)
*Patents and Designs	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Read 2° 17th April (1012)
*Patents and Designs Consolidation	*Mr. Kearley*	Read 1° 18th April (1174)
Patents and Designs (No. 2)	*Mr. J. D. White*	Read 1° 11th April (394)
Public Rights of Way	*Mr. J. R. Macdonald*	Bill withdrawn 9th April (83)
Public Rights of Way (No. 2.)	*Mr. J. R. Macdonald*	Read 1° 15th April (627)
Rights of Way (Scotland)	*Mr. R. M. Ferguson*	Read 1° 18th April (1174)
Shop Clubs Act (1902) Amendment	*Mr. J. Ward*	Read 1° 17th April (1008)
Small Holdings (No. 2)	*Mr. G. Hardy*	Read 1° 11th April (393)
Sweated Industries	*Mr. A. Henderson*	Second Reading (adjourned) 12th April (559)
*Territoral and Reserve Forces	*Mr. Haldane*	Second Reading 9th April (83) Second Reading 10th April (232) Second Reading 23rd April (1584) (1650)
Town Tenants' (England and Wales)	*Mr. Walker*	Read 1° 18th April (1174)
Trust Investments	*Mr. Banner*	Read 1° 11th April (394)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1907.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in previous Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Ipswich, and the Urban District Council of Wallasey, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	11 April	40 days
Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance),—Copy of University Court Ordinance No. XIX. (Glasgow, No. 5), (Foundation of James S. Dixon Chair of Mining) [52 and 53 Vic., c. 55, s. 20]	17 April	12 weeks
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the County of Glamorgan, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Aber, Town, and Ystrad Mynach Wards of the Caerphilly Urban District [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	22 April	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

APRIL 8—*APRIL* 23.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen
University—Annual Statistical Report, Presented, *Apr. 22*, 1343, 1371.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 522.

Abyssinia
Legation House at Adis Abeba, Estimate for.
Os. Sir G. Parker, Mr. Rees, *Apr. 8*, 32; Mr. Harcourt, 38.

Achill and Mulrany
Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 580, 581.

Acland, Mr. F. D. [Yorks., Richmond]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 248–255, 285.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A. [Somerset, Wellington]
Eleven o'Clock Rule, Suspension of, *Apr. 10*, 328.

Adjournment of the House
Objections to.
Os. Mr. Morton, Mr. J. A. Pease, *Apr. 8*, 72.

Admiralty
First Lord—Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

Administrative Policy of, Criticisms on—Charges of Secrecy, etc.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 17*, 1066–1075; Mr. F. E. Smith, 1075–1085; Mr. E. Robertson, 1085; Mr. A. Lee, 1092–1095.

Contracts—Allocation to Irish Firms.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 23*, 1546.

Fisher, Sir J., Retired Pay to be granted to.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11*, 349.

Officials in Supply and Accounting Departments, Leave and Allowances granted to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 955.

Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, Erection of.
Os. Mr. Akers-Douglas, *Apr. 8*, 52, 53; Mr. C. Hay, 56; Mr. Morton, 58; Sir F. Banbury, 58; Mr. Harcourt, 59; Mr. W. Rutherford, 60; Mr. Harcourt, 62; Mr. Carlile, 62, 63; Mr. A. Bryce, 63.

Sea Lords, increase in Emoluments of.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11*, 349.

Advertisements Regulations Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 22*, 1532.

Aerial Navigation
Progress made with—Proposals for Continuance of Agreement as to launching of Explosives from Airships, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 19*, 1268.

Afghanistan
Amir's Visit to India, Cost of.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22*, 1397, 1398.

Africa, Central
Native Labour Recruitment for Transvaal Mines, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 211, 212.

Africa, East
[*See also* Names of Places.]
Administration—Date of establishing Legislative Council and forming White Police Force.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 359.
Judges and Magistrates, Qualifications and Experience of.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 358.
Nairobi:
European and Native Population.
Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 10*, 200.
Grogan, Captain, and others, Circumstances of Imprisonment of, Place and Conditions of Detention, etc.
Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 10*, 199.
Qs. Mr. T. Davies, Mr. Carlile, Mr. Cave, Mr. Ashley, Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 11*, 355–358.
Correspondence, Date of Tabling.
Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18*, 1136, 1137.
Identity and place of Imprisonment of Captain Grogan.
Qs. Mr. Cave, Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18*, 1135, 1136.
Insults to White Women by Natives, Power of Magistrate to punish for.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. J. C. Wason, Sir C. Hill, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 15*, 592–594.
Prison, New, Provision for Building.
Q. Mr. G. Baring; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 22*, 1408.

Africa, East—*cont.*
Police Force, Information as to.
Qs. Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 16*, 760, 761.
Complaints against Native Force.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 22*, 1409.
White Force, Size and Nature of.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18*, 1134.
Population, Number of Troops, etc.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 16*, 761, 762.
Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment for Transvaal Mines—Decision as to Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 335.
White and Indian Settlements, Proposals for Promoting.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Sir J. Randles; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 358, 359.

Africa, South
[*See also* Names of Colonies, etc.]
Garrison—Increase of Officers' pay, proposed.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 10*, 207.

Africa, West
[*See also* Names of Places.]
French Territory—Trade Report (1905–6), Presented, *Apr. 17*, 923.

Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906
Evasion of, by Somerset Landowners, alleged.
Q. Mr. W. Hope; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 15*, 624, 625.
Farmers, Protection of, against Sporting Landlords.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 17*, 950.

Agricultural Land
Taxation of, Absence of Proposals for Relief of from Budget Speech.
Qs. Mr. Bridgeman, *Apr. 18*, 1241–1243.

Agriculture
Amounts voted for in England and Wales and in Ireland.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 12*, 500.
Labourer's Wages, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 10*, 202.
Statistics as to Employment in Certain Foreign Countries (1881, 1891, and 1901).
Q. Mr. Partington; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 22*, 1397, 1398.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Office Accommodation, Proposals for improving.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23,* 1570.
Salaries of Staff.
Q. Viscount Helmsley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 19,* 1259.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Grants to and Amount of Endowment.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19,* 1265.
Schemes, Contributions to by Local Authorities—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23,* 1556, 1557.
Travelling Veterinary Surgeon—Proposals for creating Post.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 1000.
Working of—Date of Presenting Report.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15,* 618, 619.

Albemarle Estate
Reinstatement Claim of O. Scollan.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16,* 777; *Apr. 23,* 1576.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Civil Service Assistant Clerks (New Class), Case of—Inquiry proposed, *Apr. 23,* 1579.
Congo Free State Administration—Charges in Reports of Mr. Jeffrey and Mr. E. Cartwright, *Apr. 11,* 361.
Fire Insurance—Payment by Companies to London Fire Brigade, *Apr. 10,* 195.
New Hebrides Convention—Information as to Anglo-French Committee, *Apr. 11,* 359, 360.
Opium Traffic, Suppression of—British Representation at Conference, *Apr. 11,* 362.
Tinned Foodstuffs returned from South Africa, Restrictions on Sale of, in London, *Apr. 11,* 369.

Alexandra Park
Betting Case, Decision in and Reason for dismissing Charge.
Qs. Mr. Waterlow, Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 17,* 976, 977.
Races, Nuisance caused by—Complaints as to Inadequacy of Police Protection, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lea, Mr. Bottomley; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 22,* 1414, 1415.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway (General Powers) Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 11,* 329.

Aliens
Arrivals during 1906—Number of Skilled British Workmen emigrating during same Period.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18,* 1147.
Non-Immigrant Ships, Number brought by.
Qs. Sir W. Evans Gordon; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18,* 1145, 1146.

Aliens Act
British Subjects deported under.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 11,* 367.
Repeal of, proposed.
O. Major Seely, *Apr. 18,* 1147.

Allen Estate
Reinstatement Claim of P. Woods.
Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19,* 1264.

Alverstone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice.*
Judicature Bill, 3R., *Apr. 23,* 1541.
Rule Committee Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1538.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Pensions, System of Calculating, *Apr. 11,* 347.

Ancaster, Earl of
Report on Historical Manuscripts of, Presented, *Apr. 8,* 4; *Apr. 15,* 564.

Annan River
Salmon Fishery Rights in—Case of T. Murray.
Q. Mr. Gulland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 11,* 374.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *Apr. 23,* 1533.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
Bills to Create Subordinate Legislature, etc., Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 801–806.
Division of Bills into two Parts, one for consideration by the House, the other to go to Standing Committee, Proposals as to, *Apr. 16,* 863.
Report Stage of such Bills, increased Opportunity for Discussion to be given, *Apr. 11,* 467.
Withdrawal of Bills from Discussion by the House, Objections to, *Apr. 11,* 467; *Apr. 16,* 805.

Anstruther - Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
- Africa, East—Nairobi Magistrates, Powers of, to Punish Natives for insulting White Women, *Apr. 15*, 592.
- Cartridges, Seizure of—Action proposed to be taken, *Apr. 19*, 1263.
- China — Assault on Representative of Messrs. Jardine and Matheson at Wuchan, *Apr. 22*, 1411.
- Colonial Conference, 1907—Exclusion of Australian State Premiers, *Apr. 15*, 591.
- Lahore disturbances, Measures taken to Prevent, *Apr. 23*, 1561.
- Lunatic Asylums District, Discharge of Dangerous Patients from and Class of Persons admitted to, *Apr. 22*, 1423.
- New Hebrides Liquor Traffic—Restriction on Importation of Spirits, *Apr. 23*, 1561, 1562.
- Rosyth Works, Progress Made with, *Apr. 15*, 586.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Statistics for 1907, *Apr. 22*, 1402.
- Workhouse Dietary—Regulations as to Allowance of Bread, *Apr. 19*, 1262.

Anthrax
- Outbreaks—Measures taken to Ascertain Source of Infection.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Jowett; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18*, 1144, 1145.
  - *Q.* Mr. Jowett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 18*, 1164.

Ardeer
- Nobel's Factory Explosion at—Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 562.

Armagh
- St. Patrick's Day Celebrations—Speech of Mr. J. Donnelly.
  - *Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Ap. 17*, 992.

Armitage, Mr. R. [Leeds, Central]
- Schools, Council and Voluntary, Accommodation in and Attendance at, *Apr. 10*, 205.

Army
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Earl of Portsmouth.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
- Accounts Department Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances granted to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17*, 962.
- Ammunition and Stores, Reserve of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 16*, 757.

Army—*cont.*
- Artillery—Reason for Transfer of Sergeant-Major Henson.
  - *Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11*, 347.
- Autumn Manœuvres, Cost of (1904–1907).
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1117, 1118.
- Auxiliary Forces (*see also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry).
  - Training of Eastern Command, Arrangements for.
    - *Q.* Mr. A. L. Lever; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 23*, 1560.
- Chief Accountant of a Command, Position of, under Order of 1st February.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1407, 1408.
- Commissions granted (1898–1906).
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1405, 1406.
  - Return Presented, *Apr. 16*, 736.
- Contracts, *see under* War Office.
- Cost per Man under present System and under New Scheme.
  - *Q.* Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11*, 346.
  - *Qs.* Mr. G. Baring, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1406, 1407.
- Economies, Method of effecting.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 16*, 756, 757.
- General Annual Report (1905–6), Presented, *Apr. 9*, 75; *Apr. 15*, 565.
- Guns
  - Conversion of 15-pounders—Effect on Ballistics.
    - *Q.* Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1392.
  - Velocity and Angle of Descent (British and German), Information as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1114, 1115.
- Kingston-on-Thames Barracks, Lavatory Accommodation in.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 16*, 752.
- Limerick Barracks, Condition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11*, 345, 346.
- Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*
- Officers
  - Appointments (1898–1903).
    - *Q.* Maj. Renton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 15*, 587, 588.
  - Lieutenants-Colonel, Provision of Sum for Increased Pay of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 8*, 12.
    - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1117.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Officers—*cont.*
Promotions from the Ranks (1898–1903).
Qs. Maj. Renton, Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 15,* 587.
Provision of—Interim Report of Committee Presented, *Apr. 15,* 565, 570.
Reserve
Eligibility of Militia Officers under New Scheme.
Q. Mr. C. Warner; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22,* 1392.
Training, Suspension of.
Q. Lord J. Joicey-Cecil; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22,* 1408.
Order of 11th March, Battery Sergeants-Major and Quartermasters Sergeant affected by.
Q. Mr. C. Salter; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11,* 345.
Ordnance Factories
Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances granted to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17,* 962.
Men employed (1884–1906).
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17,* 967, 968.
Correction to Figures in Answer, *Apr. 19,* 1268.
Pensions, System of calculating.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 347.
Prisons and Detention Barracks—Amendments to Rules Presented, *Apr. 12,* 495; *Apr. 15,* 566.
Probationary Scheme, Decision as to—Number of Guards and Cavalry Probationers passed, etc.
Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 16,* 756.
Recruiting and Enlistment—Case of H. Hartney.
Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 15,* 588.
Second Line or Territorial Army
Adjutants, Proposals as to System of appointing.
Q. Mr. Fiennes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22,* 1377, 1378.
Estimates for Contingencies and Administration.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11,* 350.
Separation Allowance for Non-Commissioned Officers, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11,* 351.
Uniforms, Cost of providing.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 8,* 12, 13.

Army—*cont.*
Sherwood Foresters—Resumption of Green Facings on Uniforms proposed.
Q. Mr. Gibb; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 10,* 207, 208.
Soldiers—Map-reading, Reason for omitting from Examination.
Q. Maj. Seely; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 12,* 501.
Territorial Army, *see subheading* Second Line.
Tidworth Barracks Hospital, Date of building.
Q. Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18,* 1115.
Tidworth Camp—Accommodation for Married Officers.
Q. Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 16,* 753.
Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

Army (Annual) Bill
l. 2R., *Apr. 16,* 732.
Com. and *Rep.*, *Apr. 17,* 935.
3R.* *Apr. 22,* 1364.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
Army
Guns—Effect of Conversion of 15-Pounders, *Apr. 22,* 1392.
Reduction in Cost to be effected under New Scheme, *Apr. 22,* 1407.
Germany, Labour Conditions in—Ability of British Workmen to furnish reliable Report after Six Weeks' Visit to Germany, *Apr. 22,* 1403.
Jamaica—Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 11,* 213.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10,* 232–248.

Art and Science Buildings
Vote for, *Apr. 8,* 67; *Apr. 9,* 190.

Ashbourne, Lord
Statute Law Revision Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1535, 1536.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
Africa, East—Grogan, Capt., and others, Circumstances of Imprisonment of—Place and Conditions of Detention, etc., *Apr. 11,* 357.
Bills referred to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills relating to Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, proposed, *Apr. 11,* 446.
Blackpool Post Office, Decision as to Erection of New Building, *Apr. 8,* 43, 48.
Egypt
Consulate at Cairo, Increase in Estimate for Erection of, *Apr. 8,* 40.
Status and Powers of Agent-General, *Apr. 18,* 1138.

[*cont.*

Ashley, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
- Greenwich Observatory—Effect of London County Council Generating Station, *Apr. 11*, 348.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15*, 689.
- Malta
  - Governor, Military Functions of, *Apr. 23*, 1559.
  - Military Opinion on Mediterranean Defence, *Apr. 17*, 1007.
- Morocco—Allocation of Contract for Tangier Public Works, *Apr. 23*, 1563.
- Schools, improvements to, by Local Authorities—Period for repayment of Loans, *Apr. 17*, 948.
- Sweden and Norway—New Treaty, Progress of Negotiations as to, *Apr. 11*, 361.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1637–1642.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Beds., Luton]
- Midwives Act—Training Schools approved by Board, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1124.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]
- Budget
  - Discussion, Facilities for, *Apr. 18*, 1235.
  - Final Balance Sheet, *Apr. 18*, 1210.
  - Statement, *Apr. 18*, 1175–1211.
- Civil Service Pensions—Inclusion of Army and Navy Service, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 334.
- Cocoa Duty
  - Incidence of, *Apr. 18*, 1142, 1143.
  - Revenue derived from and Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1193, 1194.
- Consols, Position of, Causes of Fall in Price, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1186, 1187.
- Customs
  - Act of 1842, Enforcement of—Case of Goldsmith Company *v.* Wyatt, *Apr. 17*, 954.
  - Revenue derivable from in 1907–8, Estimate of, *Apr. 18*, 1181, 1182.
- Death Duties
  - Estates exceeding £150,000 and up to £1,000,000, gradual Increase of Duty from 6½ to 10 per cent., proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1209.
  - Estates exceeding £1,000,000, Rates to be levied on, *Apr. 18*, 1209.
  - Estimated Revenue from, for 1907–8, *Apr. 18*, 1182.
  - Proceeds of new Scale, Estimate of, *Apr. 18*, 1210.
  - Receipts from, Increase in, *Apr. 18*, 1177.
  - Revision of, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1208, 1209.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
- Education
  - Necessitous School Districts—Exchequer Grant of £200,000 to, *Apr. 18*, 1183.
  - Total Cost of, in 1869–70, and in 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1190.
- Exchequer Balances, Account for 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
- Exchequer Bonds—Amounts outstanding (1896–1907), *Apr. 17*, 943.
- Financial Credit of the Country, Position of and Proposals for reinstating, *Apr. 18*, 1186–1188.
- Fiscal System, alleged Necessity for Alteration in, *Apr. 22*, 1485, 1486.
- Fruit Pulp, Sugar Duties on, *Apr. 11*, 333.
- Income Tax
  - Abatement at End of Year of Assessment where it is found that Profits fall short of average for previous three Years, Repeal of, *Apr. 18*, 1204; *Apr. 22*, 1487.
  - Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £. proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1203–1205.
    - Burden of Proof to rest with the Claimant and Claim to be made together with the Return, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1204.
    - Definition of, *Apr. 18*, 1203, 1225, 1487–1490.
    - Estimated Cost of the Scheme, *Apr. 18*, 1207.
  - Estimated Peceipts from, for 1907–8, *Apr. 18*, 1182, 1207.
  - Evasion, Penalties for, Increase of, and Extension of Period of Recovery, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1204.
  - Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 18*, 1202.
  - History of the Tax, *Apr. 18*,1200–1202.
  - Incomes of Husbands and Wives, Cost of separately a ssessing, *Apr. 11*, 334.
  - Permanency of, *Apr. 18*, 1199, 1202, 1206; *Apr. 22*, 1483, 1484.
  - Receipts from,in 1906–7, *Apr.18*, 1179.
  - Returns
    - Compulsory Filling up of Forms, Proposals as to, *Apr.18*, 1204; *Apr.. 23*, 1555.
    - Employers to Give Particulars of All Salaries Paid, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1204, 1231.
  - Unassessed Duty Recovered in 1905–6, *Apr. 15*, 576.
  - Yield of, for 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1198.

[*cont.*

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
- Land Purchase Stock, Price of Issue of, *Apr. 11*, 333.
- Liquor Licensing, Revenue derived from in 1906–7, Increase in, *Apr. 18*, 1178, 1179.
- Mint, Profits from, Increase in during 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1177, 1178.
- Motors, Taxation of, Additional, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1197.
- National Debt
  - Funded Debt, Position of, 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1183.
  - New Sinking Fund, Addition to out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 18*, 1210.
  - Reduction of, *Apr. 18*, 1184.
    - Amount Allocated for (1907–8), *Apr. 18*, 1185.
  - South African War Debt, Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1184.
  - Terminable Annuities, Position of, 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1183.
  - Unfunded Debt, Position of, 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1183.
- Newport (Mon.), Valuation of Licensed Houses in — Cause for Delay in Decision, *Apr. 19*, 1260.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Auxiliary Forces, Commencement with Certain Members of, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 333.
  - Government Proposals for dealing with the Matter, *Apr. 18*, 1190, 1191, 1211.
- Post Office
  - Revenue, Causes of Decrease in during 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1179.
  - Stamps, Causes of Decreased Revenue from, *Apr. 18*, 1179.
- Revenue and Expenditure
  - Capital Expenditure, Amount provided for during 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
  - Capital Liabilities, Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1183, 1184, 1185.
  - Estimate for 1907–8, *Apr. 18*, 1181, 1182.
  - Exchequer Balance Sheet, 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
  - Reductions Effected in Expenditure, *Apr. 18*, 1181.
  - Surplus of Revenue from 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1176.
- Savings Banks, Trustee and Post Office—Comparison of Deposits and Withdrawals, *Apr. 11*, 338.
- Sugar Duty
  - Revenue Derived from and Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1194.
  - Yield from, in 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1178.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
- Spirits, Colonial, Imported for Methylating—Incidence of Duty, *Apr. 18*, 1143.
- Taxation
  - Direct and Indirect Percentages (1906–7 and 1907–8), *Apr. 23*, 1548.
  - Local
    - Account, Exchequer Payments to during 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
    - Assigned Revenue Intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *Apr.* 1195–1198.
  - Revenue Derived from, in 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
  - War Taxes, Possibility of remitting, *Apr. 18*, 1193; *Apr. 22*, 1484.
- Tea, Duty on
  - Continuance of, at 5d. in the pound, *Apr. 18*, 1194.
  - Revenue derived from, in 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1178.
- Tobacco Duty
  - Incidence of Charges, *Apr. 18*, 1143, 1144.
  - Revenue derived from, in 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1178.
- Trade and Commerce, Prosperous Condition of, *Apr. 18*, 1175.
- Treasury Bills — Amounts outstanding (1896–1907), *Apr. 17*, 944.

Astbury, Mr. J. M. [Lancashire, Southport]
- Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1037–1041.

Athenry
- Disturbances
  - Arrests made and measures taken to preserve peace.
    - *Q.* Mr. A. Smith; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1400.
  - Outrage at Dwellings of Tierney and Mrs. Raftery—Measures for Police Protection, etc.
    - *Q.* Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23*, 1573, 1574.
  - Procedure in Arrests and Trial of accused Persons.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1390, 1391.
  - Unlawful Assembly Case on 4th April—Sentences on Ringleaders.
    - *Qs.* Mr. McHugh, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. J. Roche; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 988–990.

Attorney-General
- *Sir J. Walton.*

Attorney-General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.
Clerical Assistance, Reason for Increase in Allowance for.
Q. Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 9*, 82.

Australia
[*See also* Names of States].
New Hebrides Convention, *see under* New Hebrides.
Trade Catalogues sent to, Duty levied on.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 744, 745.

Auxiliary Forces
See under Army, *also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.

Azores
Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Baines' Name Bill
l. Rep. Apr. 23*, 1532.

Baker, Sir J. [Portsmouth]
Telephone Service, Male Clerical Staff, Decision as to placing on Establishment, *Apr. 10*, 201.

Bakehouses
Underground, Ventilation and Inspection of
Q. Mr. Wilkie; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 11*, 367.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, N. Chorley]
Bills, referring to Standing Committees—Division of Bills into two Parts, one for Consideration by the House, the other to go to Standing Committee, Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 865.
Education
Expenditure—Amount raised from Irish Sources, *Apr. 22*, 1400.
Schools, new, Provision of Money for—Date of Exclusion from Vote on Account, *Apr. 18*, 1162.
Militia—Units of Royal Engineer Submarine Miners disbanded since 1906, *Apr. 17*, 971.
Royal Scottish Museum—Heating, ventilating and safeguarding against Fire, *Apr. 9*, 81.
Standing Committees—Effect of new Rules on existing Standing Committees, *Apr. 16*, 780.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Provisions as to Establishment and Discharge, *Apr. 17*, 971.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [London]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
Aid, Grant or Charge upon the public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 413–416.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
Bills, referring to Standing Committees—*cont.*
Amendments, Attitude of Government towards, *Apr. 15*, 636, 637.
Class of Bills to be sent upstairs, *Apr. 15*, 636, 716.
Clauses relating to Money Grants, etc., to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 429.
Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, Exemption of Bills relating to, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 449–451.
Report Stage of such Bills, increased Opportunity for Discussion to be given, *Apr. 11*, 448, 473; *Apr. 15*, 638; *Apr. 16*, 838–840.
Withdrawal from Discussion, Objections to, *Apr. 16*, 812–814.
Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 10*, 231; *Apr. 11*, 392; *Apr. 19*, 1174; *Apr. 22*, 1435.
Committees, Standing
Effect of New Rules on existing Standing Committees, *Apr. 15*, 726, 727, 728.
Scottish Committee—Exclusion of, from Rule, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 665.
Egypt—Resignation of Lord Cromer, *Apr. 11*, 391.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 634–638.
Standing Order No. 47—Facilities for Discussion of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 665.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1620–1633.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Historical Manuscripts Commission—Return of Reports with Appendices and Indices, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 923.

Ballina
Poor Law Medical Officer—Conditions of Appointment of Dr. I. Clarke.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 223, 224.

Ballinageeragh
Disturbance in September—Persons Proceeded against, etc.
Qs. Sir B. Sheffield, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23*, 1574.

Ballinagh, Upper
Reinstatement Application of T. Forster.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1128.

Ballymote
School Teacher, Speech made by, at Sligo—Cause for Infliction of Fine.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 576.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [London, City of]
- Admiralty—Erection of Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, *Apr. 8*, 58.
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
  - Aid Grant or Charge upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 408–411.
  - Army, Navy, Reserve Forces, Exemption of Bills dealing with, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 477–479.
  - Limiting Operation of Rules to End of Session 1908, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 866–868.
  - Powers of the Crown, or either House of Parliament, Bills modifying or taking away to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 455–459.
  - Report Stage of Bills so committed, Allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 849.
- Blackfriars Power Station for General Post Office, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- Buildings, Public—Erection, Criticisms on Policy and Estimates for, *Apr. 8*, 46; *Apr. 9*, 191.
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Referring to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 553.
- Committees, Standing or Grand—Constitution and Method of Nominating, *Apr. 11*, 409, 410.
- Consols, Position of, Causes of Fall in Price etc., *Apr. 18*, 1229–1231.
- Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, Vote for—Acquisition of Sites and Buildings and Works in connection therewith—Explanation of Item, *Apr. 8*, 34, 39.
- Edinburgh—Holyrood Palace Restoration, Information as to, *Apr. 8*, 24.
- Egypt—Consulate at Cairo, Increase in Estimate for Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 30, 33.
- Gloucester—George Street Branch Post Office Extension, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- Hull, Post Office Buildings, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- Income Tax Returns—Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1231.
- Local Authorities' Powers as to Purchase and Holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 306–310.
- Malta Civil Governor, Proposals for Appointing, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
- National Debt, New Sinking Fund, Addition to, Out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 18*, 1229.
- Osborne House—Admission of Soldiers to Convalescent Home, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 26.

Banbury, Sir F. G.—*cont.*
- Parliamentary Reform Proposals
  - Additional Time for Discussion of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 700.
  - Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 645, 646.
- St. James's Palace Fire Alarm Installation, Particulars of, *Apr. 8*, 22, 23.
- Southampton Inland Revenue Offices, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- Spain—Embassy House at Madrid, Estimate for Acquisition and Alterations to, *Apr. 8*, 30, 33.
- Sunderland Customs Building, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- War Office Buildings in Pall Mall, Expenditure on Redecorating, *Apr. 18*, 1161.
- Windsor Park—Lawn Mowers, Estimate for and Erection of Sheds, *Apr. 8*, 22, 23.

Baring, Mr. G. V. [Winchester]
- Africa, East—Building of new Prison at Nairobi, *Apr. 22*, 1408.
- Army, Reduction in Cost to be effected under new Scheme, *Apr. 22*, 1406.

Baring, Mr. G. [Isle of Wight]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 289–291.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
- London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1493–1497.

Barnes, Mr. G. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
- Army Ordnance Factories, Men employed (1884–1906), *Apr. 17*, 967.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharges, Regulations as to Payment of Bonus, *Apr. 16*, 757.

Barnmeen
- Schoolhouse, Condition of, Reason for Refusal of Grant for New Building.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 229, 230; *Apr. 17*, 987, 988.

Baronetage
- Committee Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 566, 570.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
- Constable O'Halloran, Pension Claim of, *Apr. 16*, 774.
- Irish Administration, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 381.
- Land Purchase Annuities—Difference in Repayments under Various Acts, *Apr. 15*, 617.
- New Hebrides—Anglo-French Committee
  - Australasian Interests, Representation of, *Apr. 22*, 1410.
  - Date of Meeting, *Apr. 22*, 1411.

[*cont.*

Barrie, Mr. H. T.—*cont.*
Post Office
Cost of Scottish Services in Certain Years, *Apr. 22*, 1415.
Revenue and Expenditure in Ireland, *Apr. 15*, 624.
Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for, *Apr. 11*, 381.
Taxation Revenue collected in Ireland (1890, 1895, 1900, and 1905), *Apr. 16*, 743.

Barrow River
Drainage, Necessity for and Proposals as to. *Qs.* Mr. Meehan, Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 219–221.

Barry, M. J., Estate of
Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement Claims of. *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 1003.

Barry Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 10*, 193.

Basingstoke Gas Bill
c. 3R* *Apr. 8*, 1.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.

Bath
Butter Adulteration Case—Percentage of Moisture shown in Butter by Analysis. *Q.* Mr. Nuttall; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 11*, 372, 373.

Bath, Marquess of
Magistrates and Justices, proposed Alteration in System of Appointment, Alleged Preponderance of Conservative Magistrates, etc., *Apr. 22*, 1344–1353.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
Bills, referring to Standing Committee—Exemption of Bills dealing with Army, Navy, or Reserve Forces, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 480.
Coal production and Export in 1906, *Apr. 18*, 1153; *Apr. 22*, 1418.
Income Tax
Earned Incomes of less than £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the Pound, *Apr. 22*, 1491–1493.
Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 22*, 1491.
Relation of Death Duties to Incidence of, *Apr. 22*, 1490, 1491.
Kingston-on-Thames Barracks, Lavatory Accommodation in, *Apr. 16*, 752.

Beauchamp, Earl
Historical Manuscripts Commission—Return of Reports with Appendices and Indices, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 924.

Beauly and Ness Rivers
Landlords claiming Fishery Rights in. *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1420.

Beck, Mr. A. C. [Cambridge, Wisbech]
Gooseberry Mildew, Proposals for Preventing Spread of, *Apr. 17*, 951.

Beer
Excise Duties on, Continuance of —Resolution (Mr. Asquith), *Apr. 18*, 1255.

Belfast
Constabulary Medical Attendants, Number of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 1004.
Parliamentary Election (North Division), New Writ issued, *Apr. 9*, 73, New Member Sworn, *Apr. 23*, 1580.
Post Office Telegraph Messengers, Sunday Duty and Pay of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1108.

Belgium
Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Derby—Proposals for Enforcement of Vaccination Act, *Apr. 18*, 1156.
Tramways, Electric, Prevention of Accidents on—Inquiry into Brake Systems proposed, *Apr. 11*, 368.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
Admiralty
Administrative Policy, Charges of Secrecy, etc., *Apr. 17*, 1066–1075.
Fisher, Sir J., Retired Pay to be granted to, *Apr. 11*, 349.
Sea Lords, Emoluments of, *Apr. 11*, 349.
Navy.
"Agamemnon" and "Lord Nelson," Reserve Guns for, *Apr. 10*, 209.
Battleship Repairs—Statement of First Lord, *Apr. 17*, 1072, 1073.
Douglas Committee, Dissatisfaction with Proceedings of, *Apr. 17*, 1069.
"Dreadnought," Cost of—Reason for Exclusion of Cost of Reserve of Guns, *Apr. 10*, 208.
"Invincible," Cost of, *Apr. 10*, 208.
Mobilisation of Ships on June 14, Misleading Statements as to, *Apr. 17*, 1073.
Nucleus Crews, Working of System, *Apr. 17*, 1070.
Officers with Brevet Rank serving in Sea-going Ships, *Apr. 22*, 1401, 1402; *Apr. 23*, 1548, 1559.

[*cont.*

Bellairs, Mr. C.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Promotion System, *Apr. 18*, 1131.
Shipbuilding
Date of completing certain Vessels, *Apr. 16*, 755.
Fluctuation of Programmes, Objections to, *Apr. 17*, 1074.
German Programme, Misstatement by Secretary to the Admiralty, *Apr. 17*, 1091.
Shore Appointments held by Executive and Engineer Officers, *Apr. 11*, 349.
Navy Estimates—Alteration in Form of Vote for Nucleus Crews, *Apr. 17*, 972, 973.

Bellamont Forest
Reinstatement Claim of T. Brady.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23*, 1556.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1633–1637.

Benn, Mr. W. W. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1498–1502.

Benn, Sir J. [Devonport]
China Campaign of 1900—Awards to Engineer Officers of "Algerine," "Faure," and "Whiting," *Apr. 23*, 1552.
Naval Dockyard Stoppages for Time lost, *Apr. 23*, 1546.

Bennett, Mr. E. N. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1611–1615.

Berkshire
Charities—Return Presented, *Apr. 22*, 1372.

Berks and Bucks Staghounds
Deer Impaled and Disembowelled at Reading on 7th April and Deer Severely Bitten by Hounds on 5th April and Destroyed, Hunting of.
Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 16*, 754.

Bignold, Sir A. [Wick Burg's]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills to Create Subordinate Legislature, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 793.

Bignold, Sir A.—*cont.*
Scottish Churches Commission, Functions of, *Apr. 12*, 498.

Bills
Referring to Standing Committees—New Standing Orders.
Os. Sir H. Fowler, *Apr. 16*, 814.

Aid Grant or Charge Upon the Public Revenue, Exception of All Bills involving, proposed.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr. 11*, 403–408; Sir F. Banbury, 408–411; Sir H. Fowler, 411–413; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 413–416; Mr. McKenna, 416–418; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 418–421; Mr. Long, 426; Mr. Dalziel. 427.

Amendments, Attitude of Government Towards.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 482, 483; Mr. Wyndham, 483, 484; Mr. Dalziel, 486; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 486–489; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 15*, 636, 637; Mr. A. Smith, 641; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 648, 649.

Army, Navy, or Reserve Forces, Exemption of Bills Dealing with, proposed.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 11*, 477–479; Mr. Courthope, 479; Mr. H. Beach, 480; Captain Craig, 482; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 482; Mr. Wyndham, 483–486.

Bills to Create Subordinate Legislature, Bills to Give Effect to Treaties, etc., and Bills to Sanction Cession of Territory, Exemption of, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. Wortley, *Apr. 15*, 721–723; Capt. Craig, 724–725; Capt. Craig, *Apr. 16*, 781–783; Vis. Castlereagh, 783; Mr. Birrell, 784; Mr. Long, 784, 787; Vis. Turnour, 785, 786; Mr. S. Roberts, *Apr. 16*, 794; Sir F. Lowe, 794, 795; Lord Willoughby de Eresby, 795, 796; Col. Kenyon-Slaney, 796–798; Sir H. Fowler, 786, 787; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 787–789, 809–810; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 789–791; Mr. Dalziel, 791–793; Sir A. Bignold, 793; Col. Lockwood, 793; Sir W. Anson, *Apr. 16*, 801–806; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 806–809; Mr. S. Evans, 811, 812.

[*cont.*

Bills—*cont.*

Referring to Standing Committees—*cont.*

Class of Bills to be sent Upstairs, Necessity for Definition of.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 11*, 419, 421 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 424 ; Mr. Long, 426 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 15*, 632 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 636 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 713, 714, 715 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 714–716 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 716 ; Mr. A. Smith, 717.

Clauses Relating to Money Grants, etc., to be Exempted, proposed.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, *Apr. 11*, 427, 432 ; Lord R. Cecil, 427–428 ; Mr. McCrae, 428 ; Mr. S. Roberts, 429 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 429 ; Mr. McKenna, 430 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 431 ; Mr. W. Rutherford, 432.

Colonies, Exemption of Bills Affecting Constitution of Military and Naval Questions, or Relations with the Mother Country, proposed.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *Apr. 16*, 819–821 ; Mr. Remnant, 821 ; Major Seely, 822 ; Mr. A. Taylor, 823 ; Mr. Lyttelton, 823 ; Mr. Dalziel, 824 ; Vis. Helmsley, 825 ; Sir H. Campbell- Bannerman, 826.

Division of Bills into Two Parts, One for Consideration by the House, the Other to go to Standing Committee, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *Apr. 16*, 861, 862 ; Mr. McKenna, 862 ; Sir W. Anson, 863 ; Sir H. Fowler, 863 ; Mr. Forster, 864 ; Lord Balcarres, 865 ; Sir F. Powell, 865.

India, Exemption of Bills Affecting Government and Administration of, proposed.
Os. Earl Percy, *Apr. 16*, 831 ; Sir H. Fowler, 832.

King's Speech, Exemption of Bills Referred to in, proposed.
Os. Mr. Fell, *Apr. 16*, 855 ; Mr. Remnant, 855 ; Mr. McKenna, 855 ; Vis. Helmsley, 856.

Limiting Operation of Rules to End of Session, 1908, proposed.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 16*, 866–868 ; Capt. Craig, 868 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 868.

Money Bills, Proposals as to.
Os. Sir H. Fowler, *Apr. 11*, 412, 413 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 412, 420 ; Mr. L. Hardy, 421, 422 ; Mr. S. Wortley, 423.

Bills—*cont.*

Referring to Standing Committees—*cont.*

Motions (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman), *Apr. 11*, 403 ; *Apr. 16*, 712.

Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, Exemption of Bills Relating to, proposed.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *Apr. 11*, 445 ; Mr. Ashley, 446 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 447 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 449–451 ; Mr. Dalziel, 451 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 452.

Powers of the Crown or Either House of Parliament, Bills Modifying or Taking Away to be Exempted, proposed.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 11*, 455–459 ; Vis. Turnour, 459 ; Mr. McKenna, 457, 460 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 461–463 ; Vis. Helmsley, 463–465 ; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 465 ; Mr. Rawlinson, 465, 466 ; Mr. Dalziel, 466 ; Sir E. Carson, 469, 470 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 471.

Recommittal of Bills, Powers as to.
Os. Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 11*, 41 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 418.

Report Stage of Such Bills, Increased Opportunity for Discussion to be Given.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 448 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 448, 473 ; Mr. Dalziel, 451 ; Sir W. Anson, 467 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 15*, 638.

Where Bill has been Committed Under New Standing Order, Member to Have Same Right of Speaking on Report Stage as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed.
Os. Sir E. Carson, *Apr. 16*, 832–835 ; Mr. McKenna, 835–837 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 838–840 ; Mr. Everett, 839 ; Sir H. Fowler, 840–842 ; Mr. Lyttelton, 842–844 ; Mr. Evans, 844–846 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 846 ; Mr. S. Wortley, 846 ; Lord R. Cecil, 848 ; Sir F. Banbury, 849 ; Mr. W. Rutherford, 850–852.

Withdrawal of Bills from Discussion by the House, Objections to.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr. 11*, 404, 407 ; Sir W. Anson, 467 ; Sir F. Powell, 468 ; Sir E. Carson, 469, 470 ; Sir W. Anson, *Apr. 16*, 805 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 812–814.

[*cont.*

Bills—*cont.*

Wales and Monmouthshire, relating to, Constitution of Committees dealing with—Terms of Amendment.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 331, 332.

Billson, Mr. A. [Staffordshire, N.W.]

Income Tax Abatement—Cost of separately Assessing Incomes of Husbands and Wives, *Apr. 11*, 333.

Birkenhead

Post Office, Medical Officer for.
Q. Mr. Vivian; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 22*, 1377.

Birmingham

Betting Prosecution—Case of J. Latham.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18*, 1145.

Gould, Mrs., Case of—Reason for Refusal of Relief, by Poor Law Officer.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 17*, 949.

Birmingham Corporation Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 9*, 73.

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill
l. Rep. *Apr. 23*, 1533.

Birr

Postmastership—Reason for Appointment of Mr. C. A. Simon.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 578, 579.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]

Administration, Legislative Proposals for dealing with *Apr. 11*, 344.

Agriculture, Amounts Voted for, *Apr. 12*, 500.

Agriculture Department

Grants to and Amount of Endowment, *Apr. 19*, 1265.

Schemes, Local Contribution to—Return proposed, *Apr. 23*, 1557.

Travelling Veterinary Surgeon—Proposals for creating Post, *Apr. 17*, 1000.

Working of—Date of Presenting Report, *Apr. 15*, 618, 619.

Albemarle Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. or O. Scollan, *Apr. 16*, 777; *Apr. 23*, 1576.

Allen Estate—Reinstatement Claim of P. Woods, *Apr. 19*, 1264.

Armagh, St. Patrick's Day Celebrations—Speech of Mr. J. Donnelly, *Apr. 17*, 992.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

Athenry Disturbances

Arrests made and Measures taken to preserve Peace, *Apr. 22*, 1400.

Outrage at Houses of Tierney and Mrs. Raftery, *Apr. 23*, 1574.

Procedure in Arrests and Trial of Accused Persons, *Apr. 22*, 1391.

Unlawful Assembly Case on 4th April Sentences on Ringleaders, *Apr 17*, 988–990.

Attorney-General—Clerical Assistance, Reason for Increase in Allowance for, *Apr. 9*, 82.

Ballina Poor Law Medical Officer—Conditions of Appointment of Dr. J. Clarke, *Apr. 10*, 224.

Ballinagh, Upper—Reinstatement Claim of T. Forster, *Apr. 18*, 1128.

Ballinageeragh Disturbance—Persons proceeded against, *Apr. 23*, 1574.

Ballymote School Teacher, Speech made by, at Sligo—Cause for infliction of Fine, *Apr. 15*, 576.

Barnmeen School House, Condition of, etc., *Apr. 10*, 230; *Apr. 17*, 987, 988.

Barrow River Drainage Proposals, *Apr. 10*, 220, 221.

Barry, Mr. J., Estate of—Reinstatement Claims of Evicted Tenants, *Apr. 17*, 1003.

Belfast Constabulary Medical Attendants, Number of, etc., *Apr. 17*, 1004.

Bellamont Forest—Reinstatement Claim of T. Brady, *Apr. 23*, 1556.

Bills referred to Standing Committees—Exemption of those creating a Subordinate Legislature, etc., proposed, *Apr. 16*, 784.

Blennerhassett Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 15*, 577.

Burrows, Sir K. Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of J. Tynan, *Apr. 13*, 1575.

Castletown Bere—Purchase of Property of Mr. L. White, *Apr. 18*, 1111.

Cattle, Irish, Allegations as to Tuberculosis among, etc., *Apr. 13*, 1557.

Charitable Donations and Bequests—Meetings of Commissioners, *Apr. 22*, 1399.

Clare—Extra Police employed in Confin and Kilnaboy, *Apr. 22*, 1387.

Clements Estate Fair Rent Cases, Hearing of, *Apr. 18*, 1126.

Cloghroe Dynamite Outrage—Result of Investigation, *Apr. 17*, 990.

Colthurst Estate—Reinstatement Claim of J. Murphy, *Apr. 18*, 1113.

Constabulary

Barracks, Sanitary Accommodation in, *Apr. 18*, 1127.

Cadets, Examination for, *Apr. 18*, 1127.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
Constabulary—*cont.*
Cost and Number of, *Apr. 15*, 576; *Apr. 16*, 751.
O'Halloran, Constable, Pension Claim of, *Apr. 16*, 774.
Reserve Force at Depôt, Pay of, *Apr. 17*, 1005.
Coolroe Estate, Sale Proposals for, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1114.
Cootehill Labourers Cottages—Reason for rejection of Applications, *Apr. 23*, 1556.
County Councils, Cause for Reduction in Grants to and Amount deducted, *Apr. 15*, 620–623; *Apr. 16*, 750.
Crannagh Farm
Cause for erection of Police Hut, *Apr. 17*, 992.
Tenants, Boycott of—Police Protection, etc., *Apr. 10*, 226, 227.
Curraheen New School, Erection of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 221.
Cusack Estate
Evicted Holding of Mr. Swifte, Disposal of, *Apr. 11*, 376.
Grant to R. Armstrong, Date of making, *Apr. 11*, 375.
Dingle Harbour Improvements, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1129.
Doohooma School Teacher—Case of Mr. Cryan, *Apr. 17*, 1002.
Down, Labourers Act Grants to, *Apr. 10*, 218.
Draperstown Sewer obstruction, Proposals for removing, *Apr. 11*, 344.
Dublin
Central Model School Fees, Amounts, etc., of, *Apr. 15*, 586.
Metropolitan Police, Cost of, *Apr. 15*, 576.
Postal Telegraph Service—Supply of Messengers, *Apr. 22*, 1400.
Royal Botanic Gardens—Wages of Staff, *Apr. 22*, 1388.
Education
Elementary System, Proposals for revising, *Apr. 16*, 751.
Expenditure
Amount raised by Rates, *Apr. 16*, 778.
Irish Sources, Amount raised from, *Apr. 22*, 1401.
Grants
Comparison with Scotland, *Apr. 18*, 1126.
Increase of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 577.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
Education—*cont.*
Inspectors
Area of Duty of Mr. McMillan, *Apr. 17*, 999.
Dissatisfaction among, Allegations as to, *Apr. 19*, 1260; *Apr. 22*, 1372.
Notification of Visits of, *Apr. 18*, 1127.
Protestant Management, Schools under—New Rule as to appointment of Assistant Teachers, *Apr. 10*, 227, 228; *Apr. 17*, 996, 997; *Apr. 19*, 1266.
Emigration Statistics for each Province since 1841, *Apr. 19*, 1265.
Elphin
Disturbance of 31st March, *Apr. 10*, 228.
Preservation of Peace in—Extra Police employed, etc., *Apr. 17*, 994.
Evicted Tenants, Legislative Proposals as to—Inclusion of Future Tenants proposed, *Apr. 10*, 223.
Fetherstonhaugh Estate Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Apr. 10*, 223.
Forbes Estate Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement Claims of, *Apr. 16*, 778.
Garrison and Gublaun Police Barracks, Necessity for maintaining, *Apr. 17*, 994.
Gascoigne Estate—Purchase by Kilfinane Tenants, *Apr. 18*, 1113.
Glen Boat Cove Slip, Date of completing, *Apr. 17*, 1000.
Glencar Potato Crop, Failure of—Supply of Seed, etc., *Apr. 10*, 222.
Gore-Booth Estate—Case of E. Layng, *Apr. 10*, 224.
Gortnacart School—Decision as to New Premises, *Apr. 22*, 1390.
Government Departments
Cause for Delay in circulating Return as to, *Apr. 15*, 618.
Cost of, *Apr. 17*, 940.
Throwing Posts open to competition, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 1002.
Hillsborough Labourers Cottages, Rents charged for, *Apr. 10*, 229.
Kilmorey Estate, Sale of—Amount of Negotiation Fee, *Apr. 11*, 344.
Kilshanny—Reinstatement Application of Mrs. M. Organ, *Apr. 23*, 1573.
King's County, Agrarian Outrages in, and Condition of, *Apr. 17*, 991.
Kingstown Insanitary Houses, Closing of—Re-housing Proposals, *Apr. 11*, 343.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Labourers Act
  - Cottages, Sums proposed to be advanced for, *Apr. 17*, 998.
  - Inspectors, Qualifications of and System of appointing, *Apr. 17*, 941.
- Land Commission Rent Reductions during 1906–7, *Apr. 23*, 1575.
- Land Judges Court—Procedure in dealing with Purchases, *Apr. 17*, 985.
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1326–1331.
- Land Purchase
  - Advances, Uneconomic Holdings as Security for, *Apr. 17*, 986.
  - Annuities
    - Advantage of redeeming at Present Price of Stock, *Apr. 15*, 617.
    - Repayments under Various Acts, Differences in, *Apr. 15*, 617.
  - Migrants provided with Farms, Necessity for Police Protection of, *Apr. 17*, 993.
  - Prices—Financial Experts to Test Soundness of Present System, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 986.
- Lanesborough—Purchase of Holding of T. Farrell, *Apr. 11*, 376.
- Law Courts
  - High Court Posts on Chancery Side for which Professional Qualifications are required, *Apr. 17*, 947, 1001.
  - Supreme Court Service, Promotion System in, *Apr. 17*, 946, 1001.
- Leahy Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 18*, 1111.
- Loan Fund Society Accounts, Person authorised to Audit, *Apr. 15*, 585.
- Local Government Board
  - Officials, Religious Opinions of, *Apr. 10*, 229.
  - Public Analyst, Terms of Office of—Complaints against Sir C. Cameron, *Apr. 22*, 1391.
- Lough Cutra School—Hour of Attendance of Protestant Children, *Apr. 19*, 1266.
- Loughrea—Appeals against Compensation Awards for Malicious Injuries, *Apr. 16*, 774.
- Macroom
  - Petty Sessions—Chairmanship of Mr. O'Hara, *Apr. 18*, 1112.
  - Warrant issued by Mr. O'Hara in connection with Ballingeary Disturbance, *Apr. 22*, 1386.
- Madden Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. R. Mahony, *Apr. 18*, 1129.
- Morrogh Bernard Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 22*, 1392.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Mullaghgarrow—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. Crawford, *Apr. 15*, 585.
- O'Rourke Estate, Sale Proposals for—Inclusion of Turbary, etc., *Apr. 17*, 1000.
- Ormathwaite Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. Walsh, *Apr. 22*, 1401.
- Orpen Estate—Provision of Farm for T. Griffin, *Apr. 17*, 1003.
- Oughterard Union—Cause of Typhus Fever Outbreak, *Apr. 19*, 1267.
- Packenham Estate Untenanted Land, Sale of, *Apr. 10*, 222.
- Parkmore and Red Bay Road, Improvement of, *Apr. 15*, 586.
- Poor Rate, System of Collecting, *Apr. 22*, 1389.
- Population (1841–1906), *Apr. 9*, 77.
- Postal Officials, Assaults on—Measures for Police Protection, etc., *Apr. 22*, 1399.
- Rating System, Revision of, in Urban Districts, *Apr. 18*, 1108.
- Robeck, Baron de—Sale Proposals for Estate, *Apr. 17*, 997.
- Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for, *Apr. 11*, 343, 375; *Apr. 16*, 776, 777.
- Roscommon Quarter Sessions—Decision of Judge in action against Police for Value of Drum, *Apr. 16*, 776.
- Sandford Wills Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Apr. 17*, 984.
- Sligo
  - Land Commission Cases dealt with on March 18, *Apr. 18*, 1107.
  - Land Purchase Arrears, Amount deducted for, *Apr. 22*, 1390.
- Strokestown Union Labourers Cottages, Site selected for, *Apr. 17*, 999.
- Tottenham Estate—Reinstatement Claim of F. McGuiness, *Apr. 18*, 1126.
- Westropp Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Apr. 22*, 1387.
- White Estate—Reinstatement Claim of F. McNally, *Apr. 16*, 777.
- Whyte Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 19*, 1264.

Births
- General Abstract (England and Wales), Presented, *Apr. 12*, 495; *Apr. 15*, 566.

Blackfriars
- Power Station for General Post Office, increase in Estimate for.
  - *Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 42; Mr. Harcourt, 43.

Blackpool
Post Office, Decision as to Erection of New Building.
Os. Mr. Ashley, *Apr. 8,* 43, 48; Mr. Harcourt, 47, 48.

Blennerhassett Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15,* 577.

Blind (Technical Education, etc.) Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 11,* 393.

Bobbinite
Report of Committee Presented, *Apr. 15,* 562.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]
Blennerhassett Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 15,* 577.
Curraheen New School, Erection of, proposed, *Apr. 10,* 221.
Glen Boat Cove Slip, Date of completing, *Apr. 17,* 1000.
Glencar Potato Crop, Failure of—Supply of Seed, etc., *Apr. 10,* 221.
Mauritius
  Bacteriological Institute, Date of Establishing, *Apr. 11,* 354.
  Legislative Council, Increase of Elective Element in—Representations received, *Apr. 11,* 354.

Bolivia
Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 15,* 563.

Borax Consolidated Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 15,* 561.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 16,* 734.

Bore Stone, Stirlingshire
Steps taken for Preservation of.
Os. Mr. Smeaton, *Apr. 8,* 22; Mr. Harcourt, 22.

Boston Spa Gas Bill
c. *Rep.** *Apr. 18,* 1102.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Alexandra Park Races, Nuisance caused by, *Apr. 22,* 1415.

Bowerman, Mr. C. W. [Deptford]
Customs Watchers, Pay of, *Apr. 15,* 574.

Bowers Gifford
Polling District, Order dividing, Presented, *Apr. 10,* 194; *Apr. 15,* 567.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Army—Chief Accountant of a Command, Position of under Order of 1st February, *Apr. 22,* 1407.
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22,* 1518–1520.

Bowles, Mr. G. S.—*cont.*
Magistrates, Political Opinions of—Proposals for Appointment of Liberals, *Apr. 17,* 1006.
Mesopotamia Mineral Oil Deposits—Concessions granted, *Apr. 18,* 1138.
Parliamentary Procedure—Blocking Motions and Bills, Proposals for preventing, *Apr. 11,* 379.
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17,* 1012.

Boyle, Sir E. [Taunton]
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22,* 1502–1508, 1526.

Brace, Mr. W. [Glamorganshire, S.]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1615–1617.

Bradford
West Riding Court—Decision of Magistrate and Remarks of Clerk on Case of Mr V. Ward.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18,* 1147, 1148.

Bramsdon, Mr. T. A. [Portsmouth]
Navy
  Dockyards, Paint Manufacture in—Application of Factories Act, *Apr. 16,* 767.
  Domestics, Inquiry and Decision as to, *Apr. 15,* 582.
  Plumbers, Pay of, *Apr. 16,* 739.
  Portsmouth Dockyard
    Chargemen, Pay of, *Apr. 23,* 1553.
    Ship Fitters' Assistants, Present Employment of, *Apr. 23,* 1546.
  Ratings Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Apr. 15,* 582.
  Stokehold Boots, Result of Experiment as to, *Apr. 15,* 583.
Post Office Regulations as to Re-addressing Lodgers' Letters, *Apr. 16,* 772.

Brassey, Lord
Navy
  "Dreadnought" Type of Battleship, Advantages and Disadvantages of, *Apr. 17,* 925, 926.
  Merchant Cruisers, Value of, as Auxiliaries in time of War—Policy of Subsidising, *Apr. 17,* 927, 928.
  Policy as to, *Apr. 17,* 925.
  Scouts, Efficiency of Present Type, *Apr. 17,* 927.
  Shipbuilding Programme, 1907–8, *Apr. 17,* 924–928.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 12,* 493.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Owesstry]
- Afghanistan—Cost of Amir's Visit to India, *Apr. 22*, 1397.
- Agricultural Land, Taxation of—Absence of Proposals for Relief of from Budget Proposals, *Apr. 18*, 1241–1243.
- British Museum Reading Room—Paint used in Re-decoration, *Apr. 22*, 1419.
- Exchequer Grants for Education, Necessity for Increasing, *Apr. 18*, 1241.
- Income Tax—Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1240, 1241.
- Llanychan School, Proposals as to closing, *Apr. 17*, 981.
- Magistrates, Political Opinions of—Proposals for appointment of Liberals, *Apr. 17*, 1006.
- Naval Shipbuilding—Tonnage of new Battleships, *Apr. 17*, 973.
- Royston School—Case of Mr. O. B. Milne, *Apr. 17*, 982.

British Museum
- Accounts, Number of Visitors, Additions to Collections, etc. (1906–7), Return Presented, *Apr. 11*, 331.
- Reading Room
  - Estimated Period of Closing.
    - *Os.* Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8*, 67, 68.
  - Gold Leaf and Paint used in Redecoration.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Lea, Mr. Bridgeman; *As.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 22*, 1418, 1419.
  - Lighting of Storage Rooms, etc., by Electricity, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 613.

Brockenhurst Gas Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *Apr. 11*, 329.
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.

Brodie, Mr. H. C. [Surrey, Reigate]
- Africa, South, Garrison—Increase of Officers' Pay, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 207.
- Army
  - Cost per Man under present System and under new Scheme, *Apr. 11*, 346.
  - Limerick Barracks, Condition of, *Apr. 11*, 345.
- Building Trade, Depression in—Proposals for supplying continuous Employment, *Apr. 16*, 745.
- Buildings, Public—Erection, Criticisms on Policy of and Estimates for, *Apr. 8*, 50.
- Crown Agents' Contracts—Confidential nature of Tenders, *Apr. 11*, 335.
- Housing of the Working Classes Bill, Date of introducing, *Apr. 10*, 201.

Brodie, Mr. H. C.—*cont.*
- Local Authorities
  - Land purchased by, Use of, *Apr. 16*, 746.
  - Loans applied for, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 745.
- Police Superannuation Bill, Special Facilities for, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 202.
- Small Holdings Bill, Date of introducing *Apr. 11*, 348.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 161–164.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
- Committees, Standing or Grand—Constitution and Method of Nominating, *Apr. 11*, 410.
- Volunteer Liabilities—Position of Commanding Officers on Disbandment or Transfer of Corps, *Apr. 22*, 1405.

Bryce, Mr. J. A. [Inverness Burghs]
- Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, *Apr. 8*, 63.
- Diplomatic and Consular Buildings—Vote for, Acquisition of Sites and Buildings and Works in connection therewith, Explanation of Items, *Apr. 8*, 34.
- India
  - Budget, Date of taking, *Apr. 11*, 352.
  - Railway Inquiry, Proposal for, *Apr. 18*, 1110.
- Pensions, Civil Service—Inclusion of Army or Navy Service, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 334.
- Questions, Oral—Expediting printing of Answers, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 382.
- Siam, Vice-Consulate Buildings, inadequate Accommodation provided, alleged, *Apr. 8*, 34, 35.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, Second Reading, Date of taking, *Apr. 11*, 382.
- Treasury Bills and Exchequer Bonds—Amounts outstanding (1896–1907), *Apr. 19*, 942, 944.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*Financial Secretary, War Office* [Perthshire, E.]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 183–189; *Apr. 10*, 279.
- War Office Contracts—Allocation to Ireland, *Apr. 23*, 1558.

Buckingham Palace
- Stone Work, Removal of Paint from, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. E. Price, *Apr. 8*, 20; Mr. Harcourt, 21.

Bude Gas Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Apr. 23*, 1533.

Budget

[*For* Details of Debate, *see titles of Subjects* as Income Tax, Tea.]

Discussion of Proposals, Facilities for.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1235; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1236; Mr. E. Cecil, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Morton, 1254.

Final Balance Sheet.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1210.

Statement [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18,* 1175–1211.
Presented, *Apr. 18,* 1104.

Building Trade

Depression in—Proposals for supplying continuous Employment.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 16,* 745, 746.

Buildings, Public

Erection, Criticisms on Policy as to and Estimates for.
Os. Mr. J. Ward, *Apr. 8,* 44; Mr. Helme, 45; Sir F. Banbury, 46; Mr. Harcourt, 47; Mr. Brodie, 50; Mr. Carlile, 48, 49.

Insurance, Information as to.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Apr. 8,* 56, 59; Mr. Harcourt, 59, 60.

Sanitary Improvement, Estimate for.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Apr. 8,* 56.

Vote for, *Apr. 8,* 51; *Apr. 9,* 190.

Bull, Sir W. J. [Hammersmith]

Chocolate, Duty on and Statistics as to Importation, *Apr. 15,* 595.

Colonial Conference 1907—Exclusion of Australian State Premiers, *Apr. 15,* 591.

Burke, Mr. F. H. [King's County, Tullamore]

King's County, Agrarian Outrages in, and Condition of, *Apr. 17,* 991.

Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill

l. 3R.* *Apr. 16,* 729.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 17,* 938.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]

Birmingham—Case of Mrs. Gould, *Apr. 17,* 949.

Building Trade, Depression in and Proposals for preventing, *Apr. 16,* 746.

Canned Foodstuffs—Returned Military Stores sold in London when unfit for Food, Power of Local Authorities to deal with, *Apr. 8,* 8; *Apr. 11,* 370.

Cattle Slaughtering Methods; Legislative Proposals for improving, *Apr. 15,* 606, 607.

Census—Statistics (1841–1906) for England and Wales, *Apr. 12,* 499.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*

Children, Poor Law
Boarding-out Statistics, *Apr. 15,* 583; *Apr. 16,* 748.
Emigration to Canada in 1906, *Apr. 15,* 583.
Milk Supply in Workhouses, Purity of, *Apr. 17,* 948.

Dairies, Regulations for Control and Inspection of, *Apr. 15,* 606.

Derby—Proposals for Enforcement of Vaccination Act, *Apr. 18,* 1157.

Emigration Statistics for 1904—Comparison with Germany, *Apr. 18,* 1155, 1156.

Erith Unemployed Relief Works Scheme, Decision as to Grant for, *Apr. 11,* 370.

Housing of the Working Classes Bill, Date of Introducing, *Apr. 10,* 201.

Leicester Unemployed Distress Committee, Correspondence with, *Apr. 10,* 215.

Local Authorities
Debt, Interest Payable, etc., *Apr. 18,* 1123.
Expenditure of and Number of Persons employed by, *Apr. 18,* 1157.
Land purchased by, Use of, *Apr. 16,* 746.
Loans applied for, Information as to, *Apr. 16,* 745.

London Unemployed—Statistics as to Help given out of Grant, etc., *Apr. 8,* 7.

Midwives Act—Training Schools approved by Board, etc., *Apr. 18,* 1124.

Phthisis—Necessity for Compulsory Notification, *Apr. 15,* 604, 605.

Poor Law
Balances in Hands of Guardians in England and Wales, *Apr. 10,* 201.
Relief Statistics for Poplar, Leicester, West Ham and, Woolwich (1904–7), *Apr. 22,* 1396.

St. Pancras Unemployed Statistics (1906–7), *Apr. 10,* 214.

Schools, Improvements to, by Local Authorities—Period for Repayment of Loans, *Apr. 17,* 948.

Shardlow Union—Fee charged for Death Certificates, *Apr. 16,* 771.

Stepney Poor Law Officials, Treatment of Mrs. Baker (or Lewis) by, *Apr. 16,* 771.

Unemployed Workmen Act, Failure of, alleged, *Apr. 17,* 950.

Vaccination
Hunt, Olive, Cause of Death of—Report of Dr. Fletcher, *Apr. 18,* 1158.
Primary—Instruction as to size of Vesicle, *Apr. 15,* 603, 604.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Vaccination—*cont.*
  - Public Vaccinators, Remuneration of, *Apr. 17*, 950.
  - Workhouses, Cost in, *Apr. 15*, 603.
- Workhouse Dietary—Regulation as to Allowance of Bread, *Apr. 19*, 1262.

Burrows, Sir K., Estate of
- Reinstatement Claim of J. Tynan.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23*, 1575.

Business of the House
- Course of.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Morley, Viscount Turnour, *Apr. 10*, 231, 232; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Pirie, *Apr. 11*, 392; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 18*, 1173, 1174; *Apr. 22*, 1435.
- Proceedings in Committee of Ways and Means—*Motion* [Sir H, Campbell-Bannerman], *Apr. 18*, 1175.

Butter and Margarine Bill
- *c.* 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1056.

Buxton
- Brewster Sessions—Case of Buxton Garden Company.
  - *Qs.* Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *Apr. 15*, 597, 598.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
- Achill and Mulrany Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Apr. 15*, 581.
- Australian Import Duty on Trade Catalogues, *Apr. 16*, 745.
- Belfast Telegraph Messengers, Sunday Duty and Pay of, *Apr. 18*, 1108.
- Birkenhead Post Office, Medical Officer for, *Apr. 22*, 1377.
- Birr Postermastership—Reason for Selection of Mr. C. A. Simon, *Apr. 15*, 579.
- Coigach Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 609.
- Dublin
  - Increments of certain Officials, Reason for stopping, *Apr. 23*, 1578.
  - Learners, Limited Competitions to be held for, *Apr. 23*, 1547.
  - Postmen, Ex-Messenger Assistant, Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1106.
- Grange Corner Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1110.
- Hawkhurst—Payment to Postman Smith, *Apr. 16*, 773.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
- Ireland
  - Revenue and Expenditure in, *Apr. 15*, 624.
  - Stores—Appointment of Controller, *Apr. 18*, 1168.
- Land Purchase (Ireland) Guaranteed Stock, Facilities for Transfer, etc., of, *Apr. 22*, 1432.
- Letter Deliveries on Early Closing Days, Arrangements for, *Apr. 22*, 1377.
- Lodgers' Letters, Regulations as to Re-addressing, *Apr. 16*, 772.
- Mail Service
  - Indian Mail Arrangements, *Apr. 18*, 1159.
  - New Zealand Route *via* San Franciso, Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 773.
  - West Indies—Subsidies Paid, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1109.
- Owengallis Cross Roads, Letter Box for, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1109.
- Postage on Periodicals to Canada, Reduction of, *Apr. 15*, 607, 608.
- Postal Orders
  - Colonies in which Payable, *Apr. 16*, 745.
  - Transfer of Irish Business to Ireland, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 579.
- Postmen, Promotion System for, *Apr. 18*, 1105.
- Promotions and Transfers to English and Irish Postmasterships in 1906, *Apr. 15*, 579.
- Rifle Ranges on Post Office Buildings, *Apr. 10*, 215.
- Savings Bank—Transfer of Irish Business to Ireland, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 580.
- Scotland—Cost of Services in certain Years, *Apr. 22*, 1415; *Apr. 23*, 1568.
- Southampton Telephone Facilities, Improvement, of, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1394.
- Sunderland to Cleadon Postman, Hours of Duty of, *Apr. 16*, 743.
- Telegraph Service
  - Conditions of Service of Staff, *Apr. 22*, 1415.
  - Ex-soldiers, Conditions of employing, *Apr. 11*, 337.
  - Telegrams, Typewriting of, and altering Colour of Envelopes, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1120, 1121.
  - Temporary Assistants, Conditions of employing, *Apr. 12*, 496.
- Telephone Service—Male Clerical Staff, Decision as to placing on Establishment, *Apr. 10*, 202.
- Thornley Postman, Hours of Duty of, *Apr. 16*, 743.

[*cont.*

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*

Tramways Undertakings, Arrangements with, for Conveyance of Mails, etc., *Apr. 16*, 773.

Wages—Liability of Receipts for over £2 for Stamp Duty, *Apr. 23*, 1568.

Waterford—Route for Postal Despatch to London, *Apr. 23*, 1554.

Woodlands St. Mary Post Office, Position of, *Apr. 15*, 609.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]

Channel Tunnel—French Attitude toward Scheme, Effect of Abandonment on *entente*, etc., *Apr. 8*, 15.

Hague Conference, British Representation at, *Apr. 22*, 1412.

Lewisham Schools which have joined Schools Rifle Association, *Apr. 23*, 1570.

Patriotic Fund, Royal—Rent of Premises and Vote on which Sum is placed, *Apr. 8*, 18.

Zanzibar—Abolition of Slavery on Coast Strip, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 14.

Byrne's Divorce Bill

c. Report from Select Committee on Divorce Bills, *Apr. 11*, 329.

3R.* *Apr. 15*, 569.

Cabs

Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to.

Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18*, 1123.

Taximeter—Provisions as to Fares Chargeable.

Qs. Mr. John O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 22*, 1413, 1414.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin University]

Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1318–1326.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]

Aerial Navigation, Experiments with, etc., *Apr. 19*, 1268.

Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, Evasion of, by Somerset Landowner, alleged, *Apr. 15*, 625.

Bills, Referring to Standing Committees

Amendments, Attitude of Government towards, *Apr. 11*, 482, 483.

Army, Navy, or Reserve Forces, Exemption of Bills dealing with, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 482.

Class of Bills to be sent Upstairs, Necessity for Definition of, *Apr. 11*, 424; *Apr. 15*, 632, 714–716.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. —*cont.*

Bills, Referring to Standing Committees —*cont.*

Colonies, Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of, etc., proposed, *Apr. 16*, 826.

Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, etc., proposed, *Apr. 16*, 806–809.

Limiting Operation of Rules to end of Session 1908, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 868.

Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, Exemption of Bills relating to, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 447.

Powers of the Crown, or either House of Parliament—Bills modifying or taking away to be Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 471.

Report Stage of such Bills, Increased Opportunity for Discussion to be given, *Apr. 11*, 448.

Wales and Monmouthshire, Constitution of Committee dealing with Bills relating to, *Apr. 11*, 332.

Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 11*, 392; *Apr. 18*, 1173, 1174; *Apr. 22*, 1435.

Charity Commission Vote, Opportunity for Discussing, *Apr. 11*, 384.

Civil Service Assistant Clerks (New Class) Case of—Inquiry, proposed, *Apr. 23*, 1579.

Clerkenwell County Court—Case of Mr. C. G. Hunt, *Apr. 11*, 379, 380.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Referring to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 554, 555.

Colonial Conference 1907.

Ministers Present at, *Apr. 11*, 348.

Press Report of Proceedings, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1434.

Welcome Accorded to Colonial Representatives, *Apr. 11*, 382.

Colonial Tariffs—Treatment by Foreign Countries, *Apr. 23*, 1579.

Committees, Standing or Grand

Constitution and Method of Nominating, *Apr. 11*, 425.

Report of Proceedings, Proposals for, *Apr. 18*, 1173.

Sittings, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1401.

Defence of the Empire

Colonial Obligations, Definition of, *Apr. 23*, 1579.

Defence Committee, Mediterranean Visits paid by, or on behalf of, during 1906, *Apr. 11*, 385; *Apr. 22*, 1432.

Education, Scotland, Meetings of Lords of Committee of Privy Council on, *Apr. 11*, 380.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. —*cont.*

- Empire Day—Hoisting of Union Jack over Government Buildings, *Apr. 18*, 1171.
- Estimates, Scottish, Days allotted to, *Apr. 22*, 1433.
- Exchequer and Audit Department—Rule as to Communications to Press, *Apr. 18*, 1131.
- Fiscal Policy—Resolutions of British Chambers of Commerce in favour of Preferential Tariff, *Apr. 15*, 625 ; *Apr. 18*, 1173.
- Hexham Parliamentary Election, Cause for Postponement of, *Apr. 11*, 384.
- Houses of Parliament, Relations Between —Proposals for Readjustment, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
- Indian Budget, Facilities for Discussing, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
- Ireland
  - Administration, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 381.
  - County Council Grants, Stoppages from—Opportunity for Discussion, *Apr. 22*, 1431.
- Land Valuation Bills, Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 383.
- Liquor Traffic, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 753 ; *Apr. 18*, 1170.
- Local Government Board Vote, Date of taking, *Apr. 18*, 1170.
- London Chamber of Commerce Ballot for Colonial Preference—Number voting, etc., *Apr. 15*, 625.
- Magistrates, Political Opinions of—Proposals for appointment of Liberals, *Apr. 17*, 1005, 1006.
- Malta
  - Civil Governor, Proposals for appointing, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
  - Military Opinion on Mediterranean Defence, *Apr. 17*, 1007.
- Moray Firth, Trawling in
  - British Subjects in Foreign Vessels, Prosecution of, *Apr. 18*, 1166, 1167.
  - Legistration, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1433, 1434.
- Parents, Negligent, Power to Prosecute under existing Acts, *Apr. 11*, 381.
- Parliamentary Procedure
  - Blocking Motions and Bills, Proposals for preventing, *Apr. 11*, 378, 379.
  - Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 631–633.
  - Scottish Committee, Omission from the Resolution, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 657.
- Pensions, System of calculating, *Apr. 11*, 347.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. —*cont.*

- Questions, Oral—Expediting printing of Answers, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 383.
- Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for, *Apr. 11*, 381.
- Small Holdings Bill, Date of introducing, *Apr. 11*, 348.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Date of taking Second Reading, *Apr. 11*, 382 ; *Apr. 23*, 1578.
- Spurious Sports Bill, Facilities for passing, *Apr. 16*, 754.
- Standing Order No. 18, Amendment of, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1170.
- Telegraph Service—Conditions of Employment of ex-Soldiers, *Apr. 17*, 945.
- Welsh Church Commission—Resignation of certain Members, *Apr. 18*, 1169.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Proposals for Discussion, *Apr. 15*, 626 ; *Apr. 18*, 1171.

Canada

- Coasting Trade—Application of Resolution of Imperial Navigation Conference.
  - *Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 17*, 975.
- Intermediate Tariff with certain Foreign Countries, Proposals as to,—Speech of Sir R. Cartwright.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1140, 1141.
- Postage on Periodicals, *see* Post Office—Postage.

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal Order) Confirmation Bill

- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 22*, 1342.

Canned Foodstuffs

- Returned Military Stores sold in London when unfit for Food, Power of Local Authorities to deal with.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. H. Lamb ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 8*, 8.
  - *Q.* Mr. Alden ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 11*, 369, 370.
- War Office Contracts—Proposals as to tabling Report of Lieutenant-Colonel Hobbes on Chicago Packing Establishments.
  - *Q.* Mr. Watt ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11*, 352.

Cape Colony

- Simon's Bay Dockyard Extension, Cost of and Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15*, 573.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Herts, St. Albans]

- Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, *Apr. 8*, 62, 63.

[*cont*

Carlile, Mr. H.—*cont.*

Africa, East—Circumstances of Imprisonment of Captain Grogan and others, Place and Conditions of Detention, etc., *Apr. 11*, 355–357; *Apr. 18*, 1136.

Buildings, Public, Erection of—Criticisms on Policy and Estimates for, *Apr. 8*, 48, 49.

Clerkenwell County Court—Case of Mr. C. G. Hunt, *Apr. 11*, 379, 380.

Hull Post Office Buildings, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 48.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15*, 691.

Volunteer Brigade Majors, Expenses of—Consideration of Report and Decision as to Increase of Pay, *Apr. 11*, 351.

Carrickfergus

Head Rents, Proposals for Purchase of—Powers of Corporation under Charters.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh: *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Apr. 18*, 1167, 1168.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]

Bills, Referring to Standing Committee

Powers of the Crown, or either House of Parliament, Bills modifying or taking away to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 469, 470.

Report Stage of Bill, Allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 832–835.

Withdrawal of Bills from Discussion by the House, Objections to, *Apr. 11*, 469, 470.

Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1043.

Cartridges

Seizure of, in certain Towns—Action proposed to be taken, etc.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 19*, 1263.

Castlereagh, Viscount [Maidstone]

Africa, East

Police Force, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 760, 761.

Native Force, Complaints against, *Apr. 22*, 1409.

Bills referring to Select Committee—Exemption of Bills to create Subordinate Legislature in any Part of the Kingdom, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 782.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 528–531.

Defence Committee, Mediterranean Visits paid by, or on behalf of, during 1906, *Apr. 11*, 385; *Apr. 22*, 1432.

Jamaica—Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 11*, 212.

Castlereagh, Viscount—*cont.*

Roman Catholic University Bill, Proposals for, *Apr. 16*, 776, 777.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 147–152.

Standing Committee, Proposal for Consideration by, *Apr. 22*, 1403.

Castletown Bere

White, Mr. L., Purchase of Property of.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1110, 1111.

Cattle

Irish, Allegations as to Tuberculosis among and Proposals for Prevention of Sale of English Cattle as Irish.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23*, 1557.

Slaughter, Legislation to improve Methods of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15*, 606, 607.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]

Africa, East

Grogan Captain, and others, Circumstances of Imprisonment of—Place and Conditions of Detention, etc., *Apr. 10*, 199; *Apr. 11*, 356, 357.

Date of Tabling Correspondence, *Apr. 18*, 1136.

Identity and Place of Imprisonment of Captain Grogan, *Apr. 18*, 1135, 1136.

Nairobi—European and Native Population, *Apr. 10*, 200.

Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1016–1020.

Special Tribunal for hearing of all Actions and Proceedings relating to Instruction to Committee, *Apr. 17*, 1056.

Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W. [Derbyshire, W.]

Death Duties

Distinction between Capital invested in Land and Capital invested in Securities or Business, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1234.

Revision of, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1234.

Income Tax—Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1234, 1235.

Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue Intercepted from the Exchequer, Proposed Abolition of System, *Apr. 18*, 1234.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., 276–279.

Cawdor, Earl
Navy.
Policy as to, *Apr. 17*, 934.
Two-Power Standard, Necessity for Maintaining, *Apr. 17*, 934, 935.

Cawley, Sir F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1012–1015.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Bills referring to Standing Committee
Clauses Relative to Money Grants, etc., to Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 427, 428.
Report Stage of Bills so Committed, allowing same right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 848.
Education
Elementary Schools, Information as to, *Apr. 15*, 611.
Non-provided Schools, Expenditure on, (1904–6), *Apr. 18*, 1161.
Glamorganshire Schools—Effect of Special Religious Instrction Bill on Estimates, *Apr. 11*, 370.
Local Authorities, Powers as to Purchase and Holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 325.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15*, 693–694.
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1522–1524.
Magistrates, Political Opinions of—Proposal for Appointment of Liberals, *Apr. 17*, 1006.
Member for Denbigh, Allegations as to Votes given by, in support of the Government, *Apr. 11*, 390.
Monmouthshire Voluntary Schools—Salaries of Teachers, *Apr. 11*, 372.
Notification of Births Bill, Intro., *Apr. 23*, 1582.
Parliamentary Procedure — Blocking Motions and Bills, Proposals for Preventing, *Apr. 11*, 378.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on—Closure of Debate, omission of Scottish Committee from the Resolution, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 651–654.
Patents and Designs Bill—Memorandum as to Effect on existing Acts proposed, *Apr. 15*, 602.
Poor Prisoners Defence Act, Applications received under, *Apr. 23*, 1565.
Royston School—Case of Mr. O. B. Milne, *Apr. 18*, 1160.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
British Museum Reading Room—Lighting of Storage Rooms by Electricity, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 613.
Budget Proposals, Facilities for Discussion of, *Apr. 18*, 1254.
Colonial Conference, 1907—Welcome to Colonial Representatives, *Apr. 11*, 381, 382.
Committees
Standing — Objections to Granting Powers for Closure, *Apr. 15*, 673.
Welsh Committee—Exemption from Operation of Rule, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 672.
Income Tax
Compulsory Filling up of Returns, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1482.
Earned Incomes, Definition of, *Apr. 22*, 1481.
Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *Apr. 22*, 1479–1481.
London Chamber of Commerce Ballot for Colonial Preference—Number Voting, etc., *Apr. 15*, 625.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Additional Time for Discussion of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 685, 686, 697–700.
Taxation, Indirect—Absence of Remission from Budget Proposals, *Apr. 22*, 1482.

Cemeteries
British Cemeteries in Foreign Countries, Steps taken for Upkeep of.
Qs. Sir W. Evans-Gordon, *Apr. 8*, 30, 38; Mr. Morton, 30, 40; Mr. Harcourt, 31.

Census
Ireland—Statistics (1841–1906).
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 9*, 76, 77.
Statistics (1841 and 1906) for England and Wales.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 12*, 499.

Census of Production Act, 1906
Advisory Committees, Proposals for Forming.
Q. Sir A. Spicer; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1121.

Chairman
Civil Service Estimates—Introduction of Matter Irrelevant to Vote under Discussion, *Apr. 8*, 19, 20, 25, 29.
Matter Irrelevant, Introduction of, *Apr. 18*, 1223.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
  - Aid, Grant, or Charge upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving, *Apr. 11*, 418–421.
  - Amendments, Attitude of Government towards, *Apr. 11*, 486–489.
  - Class of Bills to be sent Upstairs, Necessity for Definition of, *Apr. 11*, 419, 421.
  - Classes of Bills to be exempted, Reasons for non-Exemption of Army Bills, etc., *Apr. 15*, 713, 714.
  - Clauses relating to Money Grants, etc., to be Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 431.
  - Exemption of Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 787–789, 809, 810.
  - Money Bills, Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 412, 420.
  - Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, Exemption of Bills referring to, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 452.
  - Powers of the Crown or either House of Parliament, Bill modifying or taking away to be Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 461–463.
  - Recommittal of Bills, Powers as to, *Apr. 11*, 418.
  - Report Stage of Bill—allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 846.
- Budget Proposals, Facilities for Discussion of, *Apr. 18*, 1236.
- Chocolate, Duty on, and Statistics as to Importation, *Apr. 15*, 596.
- Cocoa Duty, Incidence of, *Apr. 18*, 1142.
- Committee
  - Scottish, Proposals as to—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *Apr. 15*, 658.
  - Standing—Effect of New Rules on Existing Standing Committees, *Apr. 16*, 779.
- Death Duties
  - Distinction between Capital Invested in Land and Capital Invested in Securities or Business, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1219.
  - Receipts from, Increase in, *Apr. 18*, 1214.
  - Revision of, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1219.
- Education, Total Cost of, in 1869–70, and in 1906–7, *Apr. 18*, 1214.
- Emigration Statistics for 1904—Comparison with Germany, *Apr. 13*, 1156.
- Exported Manufactures, incompleteness of Return as to, *Apr. 18*, 1153.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
- Fiscal Policy, Necessity for Alteration in Present System, *Apr. 22*, 1441–1445.
- Income Tax
  - Earned Incomes not Exceeding £2,000 to be Taxed at 9d. in the Pound, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1216, 1217; *Apr. 22*, 1440.
    - Definition of, *Apr. 18*, 1217, 1218; *Apr. 22*, 1448–1454.
    - Pensions, Annuties, etc., Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1217.
  - Employers to give Particulars of Salaries, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1447.
  - Permanency of, *Apr. 22*, 1438–1441, 1445–1447.
- London Chamber of Commerce Ballot for Colonial Preference—Number Voting, etc., *Apr. 15*, 625.
- National Debt
  - New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 18*, 1212.
  - Reduction, Sum of £500,000 diverted from, to Pay for Financial Liabilities of Volunteers, *Apr. 18*, 1212, 1213.
- Old-age Pensions—Government proposals for dealing with the Matter, *Apr. 18*, 1215; *Apr. 22*, 1438, 1439, 1441.
- Parliamentary Reform proposals, Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 659.
- Postage on Periodicals to Canada, Reduction in, *Apr. 15*, 608.
- Taxation
  - Indirect—Absence of Remission from Budget proposals, *Apr. 22*, 1437, 1438.
  - Local—Assigned Revenue Intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *Apr. 18*, 1213.
- Trade and Commerce, Condition of, *Apr. 18*, 1215; *Apr. 22*, 1437.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
- *Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. Fowler.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer
- *Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.*

Channel Tunnel
- French Attitude towards Scheme—Effect of Abandonment on *entente*, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 15.

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northants, E.]
- Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1021–1024.
- Phthisis—Necessity for Compulsory Notification, *Apr. 15*, 604.
- Railway Employees, Fatal Accidents to—Number of and Inquiries into, *Apr. 10*, 203.

Chantry Trust
National Gallery Trustees, Powers of—Legislation to reform Trust proposed.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 17*, 982, 983.

Charities
[*See also names of Counties.*]

Charity Commission
Vote, Opportunity for Discussing.
Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 384.

Charles Street, S.W.
Arch over, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 8*, 53, 55; Mr. Harcourt, 54.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange].
Carrickfergus Head Rents, Purchase of, *Apr. 18*, 1168.
Jurors—Power of Crown Solicitors as to Selection, *Apr. 17*, 961.
Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1310–1318.
Law Courts—System of Filling King's Bench Division Clerkships, *Apr. 15*, 581.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Children
Poor Law, *see that title.*
Public Houses, Infants taken to, *see under* Liquor Traffic.

Chile
Trade Report, Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

China
China
See Earthenware and China.
Amoy, Consular Building at, Increase in Estimate for.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Apr. 8*, 40; Mr. Harcourt, 2.
Customs Service—European Officials Replaced by Chinese.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1410.
Opium, *see that title.*
Poppy Cultivation—Proposals for restricting Area of Land.
Q. Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 766, 767.
Wuchan—Information as to Assault on Representative of Messrs. Jardine and Matheson.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1411.

China Campaign of 1900
Naval Engineer Officers of "Algerine," "Fame" and "Whiting," Awards to.
Q. Sir J. Benn; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 23*, 1552, 1553.

Chocolate
Duty on, Statistics as to Importation.
Qs. Sir W. Bull, Mr. A. Chamberlain; *As.* Mr Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 595, 596.

Church Army
Workshops, Application of Factory Act to.
Qs. Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 8*, 17, 18.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N.W.]
Africa, Central, Native Labour Recruitment in, *Apr. 11*, 212.
Africa, East
Administration—Date of establishing Legislative Council and forming White Police Force, *Apr. 11*, 359.
Grogan, Captain, and others, Circumstances of Imprisonment of, Place and Conditions of detention, etc., *Apr. 10*, 199; *Apr. 11*, 355–358.
Correspondence, Date of Tabling, *Apr. 18*, 1136.
Identity of Captain Grogan, *Apr. 18*, 1135, 1136.
Judges and Magistrates, Qualifications and Experience of, *Apr. 11*, 358.
Nairobi
European and Native Population, *Apr. 10*, 200.
Magistrates, Powers of, to punish Natives for insulting White Women, *Apr. 15*, 593, 594.
Prison, New, Provision for building, *Apr. 22*, 1408.
Police Force, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 760, 761.
Complaints against Native Force, *Apr. 22*, 1409.
White Force, Size and Nature of *Apr. 18*, 1134.
Population, Number of Troops, etc., *Apr. 16*, 761, 762.
Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment—Decision as to Inquiry *Apr. 11*, 335.
White and Indian Settlements, Proposals for Promoting, *Apr. 11*, 358, 359.
Canadian Coasting Trade, Application of Resolutions of Imperial Navigation Conference, *Apr. 17*, 975.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Clementi, Mr., Tour of—Record available, *Apr. 19*, 1263.
- Colonial Conference, 1907—Exclusion of Australian State Premiers, *Apr. 15*, 591, 592.
- Colonies, Employment of Coloured Policemen in, *Apr. 17*, 975, 976.
- Crown Agents' Contracts—Confidential—nature of Tenders, *Apr. 11*, 335.
- Jamaica
  - Banana Trade—Effect of Subsidy, *Apr. 19*, 1261.
  - Swettenham, Sir A., Resignation of, *Apr. 11*, 212, 213.
    - Papers, Proposals for Tabling, *Apr. 11*, 335 ; *Apr. 18*, 1137.
- Mauritius
  - Bacteriological Institute, Date of establishing, *Apr. 11*, 354.
  - Legislative Council, Increase, of Elective Element in, Representations received, *Apr. 11*, 354.
- New Hebrides
  - Anglo-French Committee—Representation of Australasian Interests, *Apr.* 22, 1410.
  - Liquor Traffic—Restriction on Importation of Spirits, *Apr. 23*, 1562.
- Nigeria, Northern, Railway Construction in, *Apr. 17*, 974, 975.
- Opium in Ceylon—Increase of Traffic under British Rule, *Apr. 15*, 595.
- Orange River Colony Constitution—Delay in issue of Letters Patent, *Apr. 15*, 592.
- Panama Canal—Tabling Contract for recruitment of Trinidad Labourers, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 199.
- Paper-making, Use of Cotton-stalk Fibre for—Information in Possession of Colonial Office, *Apr. 9*, 77.
- Straits Settlements
  - Anti-Opium Societies, Resolutions passed at Meeting of, *Apr. 18*, 1134.
  - Penang Protector of Chinese, Effect of Proclamation on Opium issued by, *Apr. 18*, 1134.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour
  - Morality—Proposals as to further Reports, *Apr. 15*, 572.
  - Repatriation
    - Diseased and Undesirable Coolies Repatriated, Mortality during Voyage, etc., *Apr. 9*, 80.
    - Proposals for Continuing, *Apr. 18*, 1134.
- Trinidad
  - Local Customs Tariff Inquiry—Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 11*, 355.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Trinidad—*cont.*
  - Petition as to Port of Spain Borough Council, *Apr. 23*, 1562.
- Uganda Railway—Cost of Construction, *Apr. 9*, 77.
- West Indies—Arrangements for conveying Local Correspondence between the Islands, *Apr. 17*, 955 ; *Apr. 22*, 1410.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Emigration Leaflets distributed among Artisans, *Apr. 22*, 1409.
- Zanzibar—Abolition of Slavery on Coast Strip, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 14.

Civil Contingencies Fund
- Repayment—Date of Presenting Estimate.
  - *Q.* Mr. Haddock ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 9*, 78.

Civil Government, Cost of
- *See under* Revenue and Expenditure.

Civil Service
- Assistant Clerks (New Class).
  - Case of—Inquiry proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Alden ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 23*, 1579.
  - Promotion, Regulations for.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16*, 740.
    - *Qs.* Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Hunt ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16*, 742.
    - *Q.* Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1576, 1577.
- Assistant Clerks in Dublin Offices, Salaries of.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. M. Healy ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 11.
- Superannuation, *see that title.*
- Women Typists, Pay of—Reply to Memorial.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Thornton ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1419.

Civil Service Estimates
- Art and Science Buildings—£47,400, *Com.*, *Apr. 8*, 67 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 190.
- Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office, etc.—£427,000, *Com.*, *Apr. 8*, 42 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 190.
- Diplomatic and Consular Buildings—£50,700, *Com.*‡ *Apr. 8*, 30 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 190, 191.
- Houses of Parliament Buildings—£32,400, *Com.*, *Apr. 8*, 70 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 191.
- Legal Buildings—£46,600, *Com.* Apr. 8*, 68 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 190.
- Osborne—£9,100, *Com.*, *Apr. 8*, 26 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 190.
- Public Buildings—£313,000, *Com.*, *Apr. 8*, 51 ; *Rep.* Apr. 9*, 190.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
- Royal Palaces—£43,400, *Com., Apr. 8,* 18; *Rep.* Apr. 9,* 189.
- Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens—£91,000, *Apr. 8,* 68; *Rep.* Apr. 9,* 191, 192; *Apr. 10,* 328.
- Salisbury Memorial—£2,100, *Com.* Apr. 8,* 72; *Rep.* Apr. 9,* 191.

Clancy, Mr. J. Y. [Dublin County, N.]
- Labourers Cottages, Sums proposed to be advanced for, *Apr. 17,* 998.
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19,* 1269–1278.
- Robeck, Baron de—Sale Proposals for Estate, *Apr. 17,* 997.

Clare
- Confin and Kilnaboy, Extra Police Employed in.
  - *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22,* 1386, 1387.
- Lunatic Asylum Sewerage Scheme, Cause of Delay in sanctioning.
  - *Q.* Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 23,* 1567.

Clarke, Mr. C. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
- Japanese Pharmacopœia—Effect of new Edition on British Trade, etc., *Apr. 11,* 334.
- Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. E. J. Green, *Apr. 8,* 16.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15,* 690.

Clementi, Mr., Tour of
- Record available of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 19,* 1263.

Clements Estate
- Fair Rent Cases, Hearing of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18,* 1126.

Clerkenwell
- County Court—Case of Mr. C. G. Hunt.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Carlile; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 379, 380.

Cloghroe
- Dynamite Outrage—Result of Investigation.
  - *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 990.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorks., W.R., Skipton]
- Education Inspectors—Attitude in Cases of Dispute, *Apr. 11,* 372.
- Lune Fishery Board—Reason for Refusing Licence to Ingleton Angling Association, *Apr. 9,* 82.
- Royston—Case of Mr. O. B. Milne, *Apr. 11,* 371; *Apr. 23,* 1568.

Clyde
- Herrings landed during 1906.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 19,* 1261, 1262.

Clynes, Mr. J. R. [Manchester, N.E.]
- Telegraph Service—Conditions of Employing Ex-soldiers, *Apr. 17,* 943.

Coal
- Production and Export Statistics for 1906.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18,* 1153.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 22,*1418.

Coal Mines
- Eight-hour Day, Economic Effect of—Report of Committee Presented, *Apr. 15,* 564.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
- *c.* 2R., *Apr. 12,* 501.
  - Report from Standing Committee on Trade *Apr. 22,* 1436.
- Referring to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Walsh, *Apr. 12,* 551; Sir F. Powell, 552–555; Sir F. Banbury, 553; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 554, 555; Mr. Lambton, Sir C. Furness, Mr. Lupton, 556.

Coastguard
- Abolition, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 18,* 1132.
- Reduction, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 22,* 1402.
- Stations closed during past Twelve Months.
  - *Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Robertson, *Apr. 17,* 971.

Coates, Major E. F. [Lewisham]
- Customs Statistical Office Clerks employed on Parliamentary Return, *Apr. 19,* 1258.
- Duke of York's School Site, Disposal of—Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 16,* 749.

Cocoa
- Duty
  - Incidence of Charges.
    - *Qs.* Mr. A. Chamberlain; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1142, 1143.
  - Revenue Derived from, and Proposals as to.
    - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1193, 1194.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Aryshire, N.]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 546–549.
Kilmarnock Court House, Grant for Improving, *Apr. 11*, 338.
Osborne House Convalescent Home, Admission of Soldiers to, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 27.

Coigach
Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 609.

Coinage and Currency
Mint, *see that title.*

Collooney, Ballina and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill
c. 2R* *Apr. 10*, 193.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Jamaica—Date of Tabling Papers on Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 18*, 1137.
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1035–1036.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
India—Deaths from Snake Poisoning (1876–1905), *Apr. 11*, 342.

Colonial Audit Branch
See under Exchequer and Audit Department.

Colonial Conference, 1907
Australian State Premiers, Exclusion of—Tabling Correspondence proposed,
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir W. Bull, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 15*, 591, 592.
Minsters present at.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 347, 348.
Navigation Conference, Resolutions passed at.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 17*, 980.
Press Report of Proceedings, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 22*, 1434, 1435.
Volunteer and Yeomanry Forces, Facilities to Premiers to see, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1114.
Welcome accorded to Colonial Representatives—Resolution of Associated Chambers of Commerce.
Qs. Mr. E. Cecil; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 381, 382.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. W. L. S. Churchill.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*For* particular Colonies, etc., *see their names.*]
British Indians, Position of—Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
Coloured Policemen, Employment of.
Qs. Sir C. Hill, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 17*, 975, 976.
Ex-Governors, Commercial Undertakings of—Circular Despatch Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.
Railways Owned by Governments—Return to Remuneration of Consulting Engineers, Presented, *Apr. 8*, 6.
Tariffs—Treatment by Foreign Countries.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 23*, 1579.

Colthurst Estate
Reinstatement Claim of J. Murphy.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1113.

Committees
Scottish Committees, Proposals as to—Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Os. Mr. Pirie, *Apr. 5*, 642, 643; Sir H. Craik, 643; Lord R. Cecil, 652, 653; Mr. Smeaton, 654; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 658.
Exclusion of, from Rule, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 15*, 665.
Standing or Grand Committees
Accommodation proposed to be allotted to.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 18*, 1162.
Bills, Referring to, *see under Bills.*
Chairman, Method of Selection.
Os. Sir F. Powell, *Apr. 15*, 677.
Closure, Proposals as to granting Powers to.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *Apr. 15*, 669, 671; Mr. E. Cecil, 673; Mr. McKenna, 675; Mr. W. Rutherford, 703.
Constitution and Method of Nominating.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr, 11*, 405; Sir F. Banbury, 409, 410; Sir J. Brunner, 410; Mr. Dalziel, 410; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 425.
Devolution aimed at by Proposals.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *Apr. 15*, 674.

[*cont.*

Committees—*cont.*
Standing or Grand Committees—*cont.*
Effect of New Rules on Existing Standing Committees.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 15*, 726, 727, 728; Mr. Haldane, 727; Mr. Speaker, 727, 728; Mr. W. Redmond, 728; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 728; Mr. W. Redmond, *Apr. 16*, 779; Mr. Speaker, 779, 788; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 779; Lord Balcarres, 780.
Nomination of Members, *Apr. 23*, 1580.
Report of Proceedings, Proposals for.
Qs. Mr. A. S. Wilson; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1172, 1173.
Sittings, Proposals as to.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 22*, 1401.
Welsh Committee—Exemption from Operation of Rule, proposed.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *Apr. 15*, 669–671; Mr. E. Cecil, 672; Mr. McKenna, 675; Mr. Long, 676.

Companies
Donations to Political, etc., Societies—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 22*, 1417.
Limited, Number registered in 1906, Amount of Share Capital, etc.
Qs. Mr. Vivian, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 21*, 368.

Comptroller and Auditor-General
Retirements during last Thirty Years.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16*, 740.

Congo Free State
Administration—Cruelty, and Oppression Charges of in Reports of Mr. Jeffrey and Mr. E. Cartwright—Action proposed to be taken.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11*, 361.
British Coloured Subjects, Allegations as to Ill-treatment of.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 15.
Consular Buildings in, Estimate for Construction of.
Os. Mr. Fell, *Apr. 8*, 41.
Firearms, Importation of—Proposals for Discussion.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 15.
Lado Enclave—Period and Terms of Lease.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1138.

Consols
Position of, Clauses of Fall in Price, etc.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1186, 1187; Mr. E. Faber, 1221; Sir F. Banbury, 1229–1231.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also* Names of Places]
Barracks, Sanitary Accommodation in.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1127, 1128.
Cadets, Proposals for holding Examinations for.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1127.
Cost, and Number of.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 576; *Apr. 16*, 751.
O'Halloran, Constable, Pension Claim of.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 774.
Reserve Force at Depot, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 1005.

Consular Service
See Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Contraband of War
Private Property at Sea, Immunity of—Proposals for bringing before the Hague Conference.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *Apr. 17*, 1080.

Convicts Divorce Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 18*, 1174.

Cookstown
Urban County District—Order Presented, *Apr. 18*, 1104; *Apr. 22*, 1343.

Coolroe Estate
Sale Proposals for—Reinstatement Claims of Evicted Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1114.

Cooper, Dr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Croydon Tramway Accident—Official Inspection of Cars, etc., *Apr. 17*, 947.
London, City of—Committee Allowance for Lunch, Inquiry into Expenditure of Fund known as City Cash proposed, *Apr. 8*, 6.
Police, Metropolitan
Library Fund, Subscription to, *Apr. 9*, 79.
Weekly Day of Rest, Increase of Force required in order to give, *Apr. 9*, 78.

Cootehill
Labourers Cottages—Reason for Rejection of Applications.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23*, 1555, 1556.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committee—Exemption of those modifying or taking away Crown or Parliamentary Powers, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 465.
- Land Purchase Guaranteed Stock, Post Office Facilities for Purchase, etc., *Apr. 22*, 1432.
- Law Courts, Irish
  - High Court Posts on Chancery Side for which Professional Qualifications are required, *Apr. 17*, 946, 1001.
  - Supreme Court Service, Promotion System in, *Apr. 17*, 945, 1001.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill 2R., *Apr. 15*, 687.
- Schools Under Protestant Management—Rule as to Appointment of Assistant Teachers, *Apr. 12*, 996, 997.

Cork
- Parliamentary Election for Mid. Cork—New Member Sworn, *Apr. 15*, 627.

Cornwall, Duchy of
- *Lord Warden*—Earl of Ducie.

Cornwall, Sir E. A. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
- London Municipal Society, Subscription to by London and South Western Railway Company *Apr. 15*, 600.
- Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 659–661.

Cory, Mr. C. J. [Cornwall, St. Ives]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 516–521.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
- India
  - Army—Period of Service of Lord Kitchener, *Apr. 15*, 590.
  - Legislative Councils, Discussion of Report on, *Apr. 11*, 211.
- Opium Traffic
  - Bengal Opium available for Export. *Apr. 11*, 341.
  - German Settlements in China, etc., Restrictions in, *Apr. 18*, 1137.
  - Proposals of Chinese Government with regard to, *Apr. 11*, 352.
- Post Office Arrangements as to Indian Mail Service, *Apr. 18*, 1158.
- Straits Settlements
  - Anti-Opium Societies, Resolutions passed at Meeting of, *Apr. 18*, 1133.
  - Penang, Effect of Proclamation on Opium issued by Chinese Protector, *Apr. 18*, 1134.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.—*cont.*
- Telegrams, Typewriting of and altering Colour of Envelopes, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1120.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour, Repatriations owing to Disease, etc.—Mortality during Voyage, *Apr. 9*, 80.

County Court
- Judges, Deputy, Payments to, during Last Five Years.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1549.

Court of Criminal Appeal
- Establishment of—Suspension of Capital Punishment, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 11*, 366.

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill
- *c.* Intro. and 1R., *Apr. 17*, 1008–1011.
- Proposals as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Stanger; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *Apr. 15*, 613.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
- Army
  - Ammunition and Stores, Reserve of, *Apr. 16*, 757.
  - Autumn Manœuvres, Cost of, *Apr. 18*, 1117.
  - Economies, Method of effecting, *Apr. 16*, 756.
  - Lieutenants-Colonel, Amount required for increased Pay of, *Apr. 18*, 1117.
- Bills, referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills dealing with Army, Navy, and Reserve Forces, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 479.
- Hawkhurst—Payment to Postman Smith, *Apr. 16*, 773.
- Naval Pensions—Case of H. Keeley, *Apr. 18*, 1132.

Courtney, Lord
- Business, Course of, *Apr. 17*, 936
- Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 16*, 731.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
- Colonial Tariffs—Treatment by Foreign Countries, *Apr. 23*, 1579.
- Defence of the Empire—Definition of Colonial Obligations, *Apr. 23*, 1579.
- Local Authorities' Powers as to Purchase and holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 323–325.
- Post Office Mail Service with West Indies, Information as to, *Apr. 18*, 1109.
- Secondary Schools attended by Well-to-do Children, Grants for, *Apr. 22*, 1416.
- West Indies—Arrangements for conveying Local Correspondence between the Islands, *Apr. 17*, 955; *Apr. 17*, 1409.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
Alien Arrivals and Number of Skilled British Workmen emigrating during 1906, *Apr. 18*, 1147.
Armagh St. Patrick's Day Celebration—Speech of Mr. J. Donnelly, *Apr. 17*, 992.
Bills, referring to Standing Committee
  Army, Navy, or Reserved Forces, Exemption of Bills dealing with, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 482.
  Exemption of Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, Bills to give effect to Treaties, etc., and Bills to sanction cession of Territory, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 724–725; *Apr. 16*, 781–783.
  Limiting Operation of Rules to end of Session 1908, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 868.
Clare—Extra Police employed in Confin and Kilnaboy, *Apr. 22*, 1386.
Cloghroe Dynamite Outrage—Result of Investigation, *Apr. 17*, 990.
Crannagh Farm—Cause for Erection of Police Hut, *Apr. 17*, 992.
Elphin, Preservation of Peace in—Extra Police employed, etc., *Apr. 17*, 993.
Empire Day—Hoisting of Union Jack over Government Buildings, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1171.
Germany—British Stevedores employed at Hamburg since March 1st, *Apr. 17*, 979.
King's County Agrarian Outrages—Condition of County, etc., *Apr. 17*, 990.
Land Purchase
  Migrants, provided with Farms, Necessity for Police Protection of, *Apr. 17*, 993.
  Stock, Investment of Money raised by, *Apr. 22*, 1431.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15*, 688.
Schools under Protestant Management—Effect of New Rule, *Apr. 19*, 1266.
Turkish Customs Increase, Assent of Great Britain to, *Apr. 15*, 595.
United States—British Representation at opening of Carnegie Institute at Pittsburg, *Apr. 22*, 1411.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges
  Emigration Leaflets distributed among Artisans, *Apr. 22*, 1409.
  Proposals for Inquiry and Discussion, *Apr. 15*, 590, 625, 626; *Apr. 18*, 1171.
Yorkshire, Crime in, *Apr. 16*, 770.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Crannagh Farm—Cause for Erection of Police Hut, *Apr. 17*, 992.
Down, Labourers' Act Grants to, *Apr. 10*, 218.
Grange Corner Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1109.
Jamaica—Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 11*, 212.
Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1304–1310.
Rating System, Revision of, in Irish Urban Districts, *Apr. 18*, 1108.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Additional Time for discussion of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 701.

Crannagh Farm
Boycott against Tenants—Measures for Police Protection, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 226, 227.
Police Hut, Cause for erection of.
  Qs. Capt. Craig, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 992.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Charity Commission Vote, Opportunity for discussing, *Apr. 11*, 384.
Government Departments, Furniture for, Source of Origin and Allocation of Contracts, *Apr. 8*, 64.
Post Office Buildings, Rifle Ranges on Roofs of, *Apr. 10*, 215.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1658–1665.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council.*
London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 922.

Criminal Procedure
Conditional Licences Granted—*see under title* Penal Servitude Acts.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges, Reason for and Proposals for Obviating, *Apr. 10*, 209.

Crown Agents in the Colonies
Contracts—Confidential Nature of Tenders.
  Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 335.

Crown's Nominee
Accounts (1906) Presented, *Apr. 8*, 5.

Croydon
Tramway Accident—Inspection of Cars and Evidence given at Inquest by Superintendent of Public Carriage Department.
Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 17*, 947.

Curraheen
School, New, Erection of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 221.

Cusack Estate
Evicted Holding of Mr. Swifte, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11*, 375, 376.
Grant to R. Armstrong, Date of making.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11*, 375.

Customs Act, 1842
Enforcement of—Case of Goldsmith Company *v.* Wyatt.
Q. Mr. Seddon; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 17*, 954.

Customs and Excise
Law relating to, Amendment of, *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18*, 1256.
Revenue derivable from, in 1907-8, Estimate of.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1181, 1182.
Senior Assistant Clerks, Prospects of Promotion of.
Q. Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 11*, 336.
Statistical Department
Extra Duty performed in 1906.
Q. Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 11*, 336.
New Class Clerks, Reply to Petition from.
Q. Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 11*, 335, 336.
Parliamentary Returns, Clerks Employed in Preparing, etc.
Q. Major Coates; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 19*, 1258.
Watchers, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 574.

Dairies
Control and Inspection, Regulations in Force for and Power of Local Government Board to Make.
Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15*, 605, 606.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees.
Aid-Grant, or Charges upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills Involving, *Apr. 11*, 427.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*
Bills referring to Standing Committees—*cont.*
Amendments, Attitude of Government towards, *Apr. 11*, 486.
Bills to Create Subordinate Legislature, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 791–793.
Clauses Relating to Money Grants, etc., to be Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 427, 432.
Colonies, Exemption of Bills Affecting Constitution of, etc., *Apr. 16*, 824.
Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, Exemption of Bills Relating to, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 451.
Powers of the Crown, or either House of Parliament, Bills Modifying or taking away to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 466.
Report Stage of such Bills, Increased Opportunity for Discussion to be given, *Apr. 11*, 451.
British Museum Reading-room, Closing of, *Apr. 8*, 67, 68.
Committees, Standing or Grand—Constitution and Method of Nominating, *Apr. 11*, 410.
Mall to Charing Cross, Date of Opening, *Apr. 8*, 64, 65.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 655, 656.

Damask
Irish Linen, Powers of Board of Trade to Compel Manufacturers to Weave Name in.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Liddell; *As.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Apr. 11*, 377.

Davies, Mr. D. [Montgomeryshire]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1665–1667.

Davies, Mr. E. W. [Carnarvon, Eifion]
State Quarries, Fatalities in—Information given in Report (1905), *Apr. 16*, 768.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
Africa, East—Grogan, Captain and others, Circumstances of Imprisonment of—Place and Conditions of Detention, etc., *Apr. 11*, 355.

Death Duties
Claims where no Duty is Exigible, Reimbursement of Expense Incurred in Resisting, proposed.
Q. Captain Waring; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 597.
Distinction between Capital Invested in Land and Capital Invested in Securities or Business, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 18*, 1219; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1234.

[*cont.*

Death Duties—*cont.*
  Estates Exceeding £150,000 and up to £1,000,000 Gradual Increase of Duty from 6½ to 10 per cent., proposed.
    Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1209.
  Estates Exceeding £1,000,000, Rates to be Levied on.
    Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1209.
  Estimated Revenue from, for 1907–8.
    Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1182.
  Proceeds, Estimated, of New Scale.
    Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1210.
  Receipts from, Increase in.
    Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1177; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1214.
  Revision of, Proposals as to.
    Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1208, 1209; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1219; Mr. G. Faber, 1224; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1234; Sir T. P. Whittaker, *Apr. 22*, 1476.

Deaths
  General Abstract (England and Wales), Presented, *Apr. 12*, 495; *Apr. 15*, 566.

Defence of the Empire
  Colonial Obligations, Definition of.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 23*, 1579.
  Mediterranean Visits Paid by, or on Behalf of, Committee of Defence during 1906.
    Qs. Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 385; *Apr. 22*, 1432.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
  Barrow River Drainage Proposals, *Apr. 10*, 221.
  Burrows, Sir K. Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of J. Tynan, *Apr. 23*, 1575.
  Civil Service, Irish, Promotion System in, *Apr. 23*, 1576.
  Dublin Post Office
    Increments of Certain Officials, Reason for Stopping, *Apr. 23*, 1578.
    Learners, Limited Competitions to be Held for, *Apr. 23*, 1547.
  Education Inspectors, Notice of Visits of, *Apr. 18*, 1127.
  Questions—Power of Minister to Refuse Answer, *Apr. 23*, 1577.
  Works Board
    Character of—Statement by Dublin Chief Magistrate, *Apr. 18*, 1167.
    Clerks
      Promotion System for, *Apr. 22*, 1424.
      Religious Opinions of, *Apr. 15*, 624; *Apr. 16*, 778.

Derby
  Vaccination Act, Proposals for Enforcement of.
    Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 18*, 1156, 1157.

Devon
  Charities—Return Presented, *Apr. 22*, 1372.

Devonport Corporation Bill
  l. 3R.* *Apr. 16*, 729.
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 17*, 938.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wiltshire, Chippenham]
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 152–158.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
  Aerial Navigation, Experiments with and Proposals for continuing Agreement as to Launching of Explosives from Airships, *Apr. 19*, 1268.
  Income-Tax
    Graduation — Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 22*, 1463–1467.
    Unassessed Duty recovered in 1905–6, *Apr. 15*, 575.
  Leadless Glaze, Adoption of, in Government Departments, *Apr. 12*, 496.
  Old Age Pensions, Objections to Schemes, *Apr. 22*, 1461.
  Sugar Duty, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1462.
  Taxation
    Indirect, Absence of Remission of, from Budget Proposals, *Apr. 22*, 1467, 1468.
    Local—Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *Apr. 22*, 1462.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 110–122; *Apr. 10*, 251; *Apr. 23*, 1587.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
  Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1284–1299, 1324.

Dingle
  Harbour Improvements, Necessity for and Proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1129.

Diplomatic and Consular Buildings
  Vote for, *Apr. 8*, 30; *Apr. 9*, 190, 191.
    Acquisition of Sites and Buildings and Works in Connection therewith, Explanation of Item.
      Os. Mr. F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 34, 39; Mr. A. Bryce, 34; Sir G. Parker, 35; Mr. J. Ward, 36; Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8*, 37, 38.

Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. D. [Middlesex Uxbridge]
  Income Tax—New Regulation as to Compulsory Returns, *Apr. 23*, 1555.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Dolan, Mr. [Leitrim, N.]
Clements Estate Fair Rent Cases, Hearing of, *Apr. 18*, 1126.
Garrison and Gublaun Police Barracks, Necessity for maintaining, *Apr. 17*, 994.
Labourers Act Inspectors, Qualifications of and System of appointing, *Apr. 17*, 941.
Tottenham Estate—Reinstatement Claim of F. McGuinness, *Apr. 18*, 1126.
Whyte Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 19*, 1264.

Domincan Republic
Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Doohooma
School Teacher—Case of Mr. Cryan.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 1002.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
Moray Firth, Trawling in—Prosecution of British Subjects in Foreign Vessels, *Apr. 18*, 1166, 1167.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 52, 53.
Charles Street, Arch over, Proposals as to, *Apr. 8*, 53, 55.
Kensington Palace Orangery, Restoration of Carvings, etc., *Apr. 8*, 19.
National Gallery Extension, Cost, etc., *Apr. 8*, 53.
"Physical Energy" Statue, Progress made with Casting and Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 53, 55.
Stationery Office Warehouse, Cost of Erection, *Apr. 8*, 53.

Down
Labourers Act Grants to.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 10*, 218.

Draperstown
Sewer Obstruction, Proposals for removing.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11*, 344.

Dublin
Central Model School Fees, Amount and Allocation of.
Q. Mr. T. Harrington; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 586.
Metropolitan Police, Cost of.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 576.

Dublin—*cont.*
Post Office
Increments of certain Officials, Reason for stopping.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 23*, 1578.
Learners, Limited Competitions to be held for.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 23*, 1547.
Postmen, ex-Messenger Assistant, Position of.
Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1106.
Registry of Deeds Office—Reply to Memorial for increase of Salaries.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 10*, 231.
Royal Botanic Gardens—Wages of Staff.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1387, 1388.
Telegraph Service, Supply of Messengers for.
Q. Mr. A. Smith; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1400.

Duke of York's School
Accommodation at Chelsea and at Dover—Decision as to Disposal of Chelsea Site.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1393.
Site, Disposal of—Constitution of Committee.
Q. Major Coates; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 16*, 749.

Dumbarton
Post Office, New, Site for.
Qs. Mr. J. D. White, *Apr. 8*, 45.
Sewerage, Proposals for improving.
Qs. Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 18*, 1165.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
Dunbarton Sewerage, Proposals for improving, *Apr. 18*, 1165.

Dunne, Major E. M. [Walsall]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 263-266.

Earthenware and China
Leadless Glaze, Adoption of, in Government Departments.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 12*, 496, 497.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Grants by, out of City Church Fund, in 1906.
Q. Sir D. B. Jones; *A.* Mr. Tomkinson, *Apr. 23*, 1571.

Edinburgh
- Footpath between Holyrood Park and King's Park, Lighting of.
  - *Os.* Mr. McCrae, *Apr. 8*, 69; Mr. Harcourt, 70.
- Grassmarket, Legality of Proposals to hold Sheep Market in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Gulland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1422.
- Holyrood Palace Restoration, Information as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Morton, *Apr. 8*, 19, 22, 24; Mr. Harcourt, 21, 23; Sir F. Banbury, 24.
- Law Courts, Improvement of.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. E. Price, *Apr. 8*, 56, 57; Mr. Morton, 57.
- Post Office Extension in, Urgency of the Matter.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. E. Price, *Apr. 8*, 45.
- Royal Observatory—Report Presented, *Apr. 11*, 331; *Apr. 15*, 565.

Education
- Total Cost of, in 1869–70, and in 1906–7.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1190; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1214.

Education, Board of
- *President*—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. S. Lough.

Education (England and Wales)
- [*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
  - Attendance—Exemption of Children under Seven from attending School over one Mile away, Powers of County Councils as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 22*, 1416.
- Code, Date of Tabling.
  - *Q.* Sir F. Powell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 17*, 981.
- Elementary Schools, Information as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. D. A. Thomas, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 15*, 610, 611.
- Eton, Winchester, and Harrow Schools, Expenditure on.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 15*, 609.
- Grants
  - Exchequer Grants, Necessity for increasing.
    - *Os.* Mr. Bridgeman, *Apr. 18*, 1241.
  - Special Grants (1906–7), Statement Presented, *Apr. 11*, 331; *Apr. 15*, 565.
- Inspectors—Attitude in Cases of Dispute.
  - *Q.* Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 11*, 372.

Education (England and Wales—*cont.*
- Local Contributions to and Cost per Head of Population.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lough, *Apr. 12*, 498.
- Necessitous School Districts—Exchequer Grant of £200,000 to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1183.
- Schools
  - Council and Voluntary, Accommodation in and Attendance at.
    - *Q.* Mr. Armitage; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 10*, 205.
  - New
    - Legislative Proposals for authorising Erection of.
      - *Q.* Lord E. Talbot; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 18*, 1159.
    - Provision of Money for—Date of excluding from Vote on Account.
      - *Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1162.
  - Non-Provided, Amounts expended on (1904–1906).
    - *Qs.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 18*, 1161.
  - Structural, etc., Improvements to, by Local Authorities—Period for Repayment of Loans.
    - *Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 17*, 948.
- Secondary Education, Endowments Available for.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 15*, 609.
- Secondary Schools attended by Well-to-do Children, Grants made to.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 22*, 1416.
- Teachers' Preliminary Instruction—Regulations Presented, *Apr. 15*, 570; *Apr. 16*, 729.
- Welsh Department Officers, Control of Permanent Secretary over.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Mc-Kenna, *Apr. 9*, 78.

Education (Ireland)
- [*For* particular places *see their names.*]
- Elementary System, Proposals for revising.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 751.
- Expenditure—Amount raised from Irish Sources.
  - *Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1400, 1401.
- Grants
  - Comparison with Scotland.
    - *Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1126.
  - Increase of, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 577.

[*cont.*

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*
Inspectors
Area of Duty of Mr. McMillan.
Q. Mr. Gwynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 998, 999.
Dissatisfaction among, Allegations as to.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19,* 1260; *Apr. 22,* 1372.
Notice of Visits, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18,* 1127.
Protestant Management, Schools under, Operation of New Rule as to Assistant Teachers.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10,* 227, 228.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Sloan, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 17,* 995–997.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19,* 1266.
Rates Amount raised by.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16,* 778.

Education (Scotland)
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
Arithmetic, Memorandum asto Teaching of, Presented, *Apr. 18,* 1101, 1104.
Consolidation of Statutes, proposed.
Q. Mr. Gulland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22,* 1422.
General Report by Inspector, Presented, *Apr. 9,* 75; *Apr. 15,* 565.
Grants (1906–7) and Cost Per Head of Population.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 12,* 497.
Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, Meetings of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Morton, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 380, 381.
Secondary and Technical—Application of Funds allocated for Technical Instruction by Local Authorities—Return Presented, *Apr. 12,* 495.
Senior Students, Training and General Education of.
Q. Mr. Gulland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 11,* 374.
Training in Teaching of Hygiene—Report Presented, *Apr. 12,* 495, *Apr. 15,* 565.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill
l. R.* *Apr. 17,* 922.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) Bill.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 23,* 1534.

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill
c. Report from the Standing Committee on Law, *Apr. 23,* 1580.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
Member for Denbigh, Allegations as to, Votes given by, in Support of the Government — Personal Explanation, *Apr. 11,* 385–389; *Apr. 22,* 1435.

Edwards, Mr. E. [Hanley]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12,* 508–511.

Egypt
Agent-General, *Status* and Powers of.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18,* 1138.
British Consular Service—Standard of Proficiency in the Native Language.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 364.
Cattle Importation—Precautions against Diseased Cattle.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 364, 365.
Concessions Board, Constitution of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 362, 363.
Consulate at Cairo, Increase in Estimate for Erection of.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8,* 30, 33; Mr. Morton, 30, 40; Mr. Harcourt, 31, 41; Sir G. Parker, 35; Mr. Ashley, 40.
Cromer, Lord, Resignation of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 11,* 391.
Statement [Sir E. Grey], *Apr. 11,* 390.
Finances, Administration and Condition—Report (1906) Presented, *Apr. 8,* 3; *Apr. 15,* 563.
Landholders—Penalties for Infraction of Rules.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 363.
Milk Supply, etc.—Regulations for preventing Adulteration.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 364.
Newspapers—Subsidies granted to *Al Mokattam, Al Wartan,* and *Les Progres.*
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 363, 364.
Pharmacy Laws—Amendment to give Right of Search and Seizure, proposed.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18,* 1140.
Secret Service, Sums granted for, during past Five Years.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 362.

[*cont.*

Egypt—*cont.*
Sugar, Refined, Royalty on.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1140.
Water Supply—Despatch of Earl of Cromer, Presented, *Apr. 17*, 923, 938.

Egyptian Guaranteed Loan of 1885
Accounts (1906–7) Presented, *Apr. 8*, 6; *Apr. 15*, 567.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 22*, 1342.

Eleven o'Clock Rule
Suspension of.
Qs. Mr. J. A. Pease, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *Apr. 10*, 328.
Motion [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Apr. 11*, 397; *Apr. 15*, 628; *Apr. 18*, 1175.

Ellenborough, Lord
Navy
"Dreadnought" Type of Battleship, Advantages and Disadvantages of, *Apr. 17*, 928.
Scouts, Efficiency of Present Type, *Apr. 17*, 928.
Navy Estimates, Method of Voting, Alteration of, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 929.

Elliot Junction
Railway Accident—Decision as to Remission of Sentence on Gourlay.
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 11*, 374, 375.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1508–1510.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 639–641.
Population, Revenue and Expenditure, Progress of—Issue of Memorandum, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1163.

Elphin
Disturbance on 31st March—Measures for Police Protection, etc.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 228.
Preservation of Peace in—Extra Police employed, etc.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 993, 994.

Emigration and Immigration
Ireland—Statistics for each Province since 1841.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19*, 1264, 1265.
Poll Tax on Immigrants, proposed.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 17*, 976.

Emigration and Immigration—*cont.*
Scottish Emigration Statistics (1897–1906).
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 17*, 977, 978.
Statistics for 1904—Comparison with Germany.
Qs. Captain Faber, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 18*, 1155, 1156.

Empire Day
Union Jack, Hoisting on Government Buildings, proposed.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1171.

Erith
Unemployed Relief Works Scheme, Decision as to Grant for.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 11*, 370.

Estate Duty
Deductions under Finance Act, 1896, 21 Sec.
Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18*, 1256.

Estimates
[*See also titles* Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates *and* Navy Estimates.]
Scottish, Days allotted to.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 22*, 1433.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
Bills, referring to Standing Committees.
Exemption of Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, etc., proposed, *Apr. 16*, 811, 812.
Report Stage of Bills so committed, allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 844–846.

Evans-Gordon, Major Sir W. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Aliens brought by Non-Immigrant Ships, *Apr. 18*, 1145, 1146.
Cemeteries, British, in Foreign Countries, Steps taken for Upkeep of, *Apr. 8*, 30, 38.
Osborne House—Admission of Soldiers to Convalescent Home, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 27.
Victoria and Albert Museum—Condition of Post Office Opposite, *Apr. 8*, 48.

Everett, Mr. R. L. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
Report Stage of Bills, Allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House proposed, *Apr. 16*, 839.

Evictions
See under Ireland

Exchequer Balances
Account for 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1180.

Exchequer Bonds
Amounts Outstanding (1896–1907).
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 17*, 942, 943.

Exchequer and Audit Department
Annual Leave Regulations
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1119.
Book-keeping as Examination Subject, Regulations for.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1119.
Colonial Audit Branch
Auditors, System of appointing.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1551.
Circumstances of formation of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1549, 1550.
Clerks admitted to (1889–1906).
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1118.
Information communicated by Officials to Press, etc., Regulation Prohibiting.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 11*, 332.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1130, 1131.

Exports and Imports
Dutiable Articles imported from the Colonies in 1906, Value of.
Q. Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15*, 602.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 22*, 1418.
Exported Manufactures, Incompleteness of Return as to.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1153.
Tables (1900–1906) Presented, *Apr. 15*, 566, 570.

Faber, Capt. W. V. [Hants, Andover]
Africa, East—Grogan, Captain, and others, Circumstances of Imprisonment of—Place and Conditions of Detention, etc., *Apr. 22*, 357.
Army
Artillery, Reason for Transfer of Sergeant-Major Henson, *Apr. 11*, 347.
Probationary Scheme, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 756.
Tidworth Barracks Hospital, Date of Building, *Apr. 18*, 1115.

Faber, Capt. W. V.—*cont.*
Birmingham Betting Prosecution—Case of J Latham, *Apr. 18*, 1145.
Emigration Statistics for 1904—Comparison with Germany, *Apr. 18*, 1155, 1156.
Land Purchase Stock, Price of Issue of, *Apr. 11*, 333.
Loughrea—Appeals against Compensation Awards for Malicious Injuries, *Apr. 16*, 774.
Old Age Pensions—Commencing with certain Members of Auxiliary Forces, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 333.
Roscommon Quarter Sessions—Decision of Judge in Action against Police for Value of Drum, *Apr. 16*, 775, 776.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Consols, Position of, Causes of Fall in Price, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1221.
Death Duties, Revision of, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1224.
Income-tax on Earned Incomes not Exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £ proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1224.
National Debt—New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 18*, 1220.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 644.
Royston School—Case of Mr. O. B. Milne, *Apr. 18*, 1160.
Stocks and Shares, Causes of Depreciation in, *Apr. 18*, 1220–1222.

Faber, Mr. G. H. [Boston]
Revolvers, Restriction on Sale of, *Apr. 11*, 214.

Falkland, Viscount
Army (Annual) Bill, *Com.*, *Apr. 17*, 925.

Falmouth Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *Apr. 23*, 1533.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
County Councils, Cause for Deductions in Grants to, *Apr. 15*, 620.
Cusack Estate
Evicted Holding of Mr. Swifte, Disposal of, *Apr. 11*, 375.
Grant to R. Armstrong, Date of Making, *Apr. 11*, 375.
Lanesborough—Purchase of Holding of T. Farrell, *Apr. 11*, 376.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
Africa, East—Population, Number of Troops, etc., *Apr. 16*, 761.
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—King's Speech, Exemption of Bills referred to in, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 855.

[*cont.*

Fell, Mr. A.—*cont.*
- Congo Free State
  - Consular Buildings in, Estimate for Construction of, *Apr. 8*, 41.
  - Lado Enclave—Period and Terms of Lease of, *Apr. 18*, 1138.
- Fiscal Policy—British Chambers of Commerce in Favour of Preferential Tariff, *Apr. 18*, 1173.
- France—Chancery of British Embassy in Paris, Estimate for Re-construction of, *Apr. 8*, 41.
- Germany—British Labourers going to and returning from Hamburg, *Apr. 11*, 369.
- Militia Artillery, Norfolk and Suffolk—Training Proposals, *Apr. 18*, 1115.
- Post Office Mail Service—Proposals as to New Zealand route *via* San Francisco, *Apr. 16*, 773.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.]
- Achill and Mulrany Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Apr. 15*, 580.
- Education Grants—Comparison with Scotland, *Apr. 18*, 1126.
- Land Purchase Annuities, Advantage of Redeeming at Present Price of Stock, *Apr. 15*, 616.
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1279–1284.
- Liquor Traffic, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 753; *Apr. 18*, 1169.
- Mullaghgarrow—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. Crawford, *Apr. 15*, 584.
- Sligo Land Commission, Cases dealt with on 18th March, *Apr. 18*, 1107.

Fetherstonhaugh Estate
- Untenanted Land, Proposals for Purchase of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 223.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Coolroe Estate, Sale Proposals for, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1114.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Admiralty, Leave, etc., of Officials in Supply and Accounting Departments, *Apr. 17*, 955.
- Army Accounts Department and Ordnance Factories—Leave and Allowances of Clerical Staff, *Apr. 17*, 962.
- Birr Postmastership—Reason for Selection of Mr. C. A. Simon, *Apr. 15*, 578.
- Cattle, Irish, Allegations as to Tuberculosis among, *Apr. 23*, 1557.
- Civil Service Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Apr. 16*, 740.
- Comptroller and Auditor-General—Retirements during last Thirty Years, *Apr. 16*, 740.

Field, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- County Court Deputy Judges, Payments to during last Five Years, *Apr. 23*, 1549.
- Exchequer and Audit Department
  - Annual Leave Regulations, *Apr. 18*. 1119.
  - Book-keeping as Examination Subject, *Apr. 18*, 1119.
  - Colonial Audit Branch
    - Clerks admitted to (1889–1906), *Apr. 18*, 1118.
    - System of appointing Auditor, *Apr. 23*, 1549, 1551.
  - Press Communication, Rule as to, *Apr. 18*, 1130.
  - Regulation Prohibiting Communication of Information to Press, etc., *Apr. 11*, 332.
- Government Department Luncheon Rooms, Cost of Upkeep of, *Apr. 23*, 1550.
- Irish Administration—Accounts subject to Partial Local Audit, *Apr. 16*, 740.
- Jurors in Ireland—Power of Crown Solicitors as to Selection, *Apr. 17*, 961.
- Kingstown Insanitary Houses, Closing of—Rehousing Proposals, *Apr. 11*, 343.
- Post Office
  - Postal Orders—Transfer of Irish Business to Ireland, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 579.
  - Promotions and Transfers to English and Irish Postmasterships in 1906, *Apr. 15*, 579.
  - Savings Bank—Transfer of Irish Business to Ireland, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 580.
- War Office
  - Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances of, *Apr. 17*, 962.
  - Meat Contracts Allocated to Armour & Co., *Apr. 17*, 962.

Fiennes, Mr. E. E. [Oxfordshire, Banbury]
- Army Second Line—System of appointing Adjutants, *Apr. 22*, 1377.
- Liquor Traffic—Reports received as to Children taken into Public-houses, *Apr. 22*, 1379.
- South African War Service of Auxiliary Forces, *Apr. 22*, 1378.

Financial Relations between Ireland and Great Britain
- Sums Voted for certain Services, Comparison of.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 571.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanark, N.E.]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 534.
- Land Valuation Bills, Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 383.

Fire Insurance
  Payment by Companies to London Fire Brigade.
    Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 10*, 195.

First Commissioner of Works
  Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.

First Lord of the Admiralty
  Lord Tweedmouth.

First Lord of the Treasury
  Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Fiscal Policy
  Allocation of Present System, Necessity for.
    Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22*, 1441–1445; Mr. McKenna, 1459; Mr. Asquith, 1485, 1486.
  Preference within the Empire, Resolutions of British Chambers of Commerce in Favour of.
    Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1173.

Fisheries
  Trawling
    "Campania" Damage done to Nets by—Representations to Norwegian Government.
      Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1419, 1420.
    Moray Firth, *see that title.*

Fitzgerald's Divorce Bill
  c. Report from Select Committee on Divorce Bills, *Apr. 11*, 329.

Fitzmaurice, Lord—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs.*
  Hague Conference, Names of British Delegates, *Apr. 22*, 1344.
  United States—British Representation at Opening of Carnegie Institute at Pittsburg, *Apr. 22*, 1366.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
  Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1059.
  Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1304, 1305.
  Ormathwaite Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. Walsh, *Apr. 22*, 1401.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
  Ballinageeragh Disturbance—Persons Proceeded against, *Apr. 23*, 1574.
  Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1062.

Folkestone, Sandgate and Hythe Tramway Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 8*, 2.

Forbes Estate
  Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement Claims of.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 777, 778.

Foreign Office
  Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
  Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]
  Bill, sreferring to Standing Committees—Division of Bills into Two Parts, One for Consideration by the House, the other to go to Standing Committee, Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 864.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H.—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster* [Wolverhampton, E.]
  Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—New Standing Orders, *Apr. 16*, 814.
    Aid Grant or Charge upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving proposed, *Apr. 11*, 411–413.
    Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 786, 787.
    Division of Bills into Two Parts, One for Consideration by the House, the other to go to Standing Committee, Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 863.
    India, Exemption of Bills affecting Government and Administration of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 832.
    Money Bills, Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 412, 413.
    Report Stage of Bills so committed Allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 840–842.
  Parliamentary Reform, Proposals—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 666.

France
  Chancery of British Embassy in Paris, Estimate for Re-construction of.
    Os. Mr. Morton, *Apr. 8*, 40; Mr. Fell, 41; Mr. Harcourt, 41.

Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities (No. 2) Bill
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 9*, 83.

Fruit Pulp
  Sugar Duties on.
    Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 11*, 332, 333.

Furness, Sir C. [Hartlepool]
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Referring to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 556.

Galwey's Divorce Bill
- *c.* Report from Select Committee on Divorce Bills, *Apr. 11*, 330.
- 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 569.

Garrison and Gublaun
- Police Barracks Necessity for maintaining. *Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 994.

Gas Companies (Metropolis)
- Accounts Presented, *Apr. 15*, 568.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill
- *l.* 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1533.

Gascoigne Estate
- Kilfinane Town Tenants, Purchase by. *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1112, 1113.

Germany
- Hamburg
  - British Labourers going to, and returning from, during Past Four Weeks.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 11*, 369.
    - *Qs.* Viscount Turnour, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 17*, 979.
  - Destitute British Subjects applying at Consulate for Relief.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. Parker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 764, 765.
- Labour Conditions in—Ability of British Workmen to furnish Reliable Report after Six Weeks Visit to Germany.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Hunt, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1403, 1404.
- Metz Smallpox Epidemic—Regulations as to Vaccination, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lupton; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1141.
- Municipal Trading in certain Towns, Statistics as to—Return ordered, *Apr. 9*, 75.
- Trade Reports Presented, *Apr. 23*, 1534.

Gibb, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Harrow]
- Army—Sherwood Foresters, Resumption of Green Facings on Uniforms proposed, *Apr. 10*, 207.

Gibraltar
- Dockyard Extension Scheme, Buildings omitted from.
  - *Q.* Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11*, 348.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork County, W.]
- Castletown Bere—Purchase of Mr. L. White's Property, *Apr. 18*, 1110.
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1293.
- Leahy Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 18*, 1111.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
- Agricultural Department Schemes, Local Contributions to—Return proposed, *Apr. 23*, 1556.
- County Councils in Ireland, Deductions from Grants to, *Apr. 16*, 750.
- Evicted Tenants, Legislative Proposals as to—Inclusion of Future Tenants, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 222.
- Fetherstonhaugh Estate Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Apr. 10*, 223.
- Land Judge's Court—Procedure in Dealing With Purchases, *Apr. 17*, 985.
- Land Purchase.
  - Advances, Uneconomic Holdings as Security for, *Apr. 17*, 986.
  - Guarantee Fund, Position of, *Apr. 22*, 1374.
  - Prices—Financial Experts to Test Soundness of Present System, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 985, 986.
- Packenham Estate Untenanted Land, Sale of, *Apr. 10*, 222.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
- Alexandra Park
  - Betting Case, Decision in, *Apr. 17*, 977.
  - Races, Nuisance Caused by, *Apr. 22*, 1414, 1415.
- Aliens.
  - Arrivals During 1906 and Number of Skilled British Workmen Emigrating, *Apr. 18*, 1147.
  - Non-immigrant Ships, Number brought by, *Apr. 18*, 1146.
- Aliens Act—British Subjects Deported under, *Apr. 11*, 367.
- Anthrax Outbreaks—Measures taken to Ascertain Source of Infection, *Apr. 18*, 1144, 1145.
- Bakehouses, Underground, Ventilation and Inspection of, *Apr. 11*, 367.
- Birmingham Betting Prosecution—Case of J. Lathom, *Apr. 18*, 1145.
- Bradford—Decision of Magistrate and Remarks of Clerk in Case of Mr. V. Ward, *Apr. 18*, 1148.
- Cabs
  - Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to, *Apr. 18*, 1123.
  - Taximeter—Provision as to Fares Chargeable, *Apr. 22*, 1413, 1414.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*

Cartridges, Seizure of—Action proposed to be Taken, *Apr. 19*, 1263.

Church Army Workshops, Application of Factory Act to, *Apr. 8*, 17, 18.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 507, 536–545, 547, 548.

Criminal Appeal Court, Establishment of—Suspension of Capital Punishment, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 366.

Croydon Tramway Accident—Official Inspection of Cars, etc., *Apr. 17*, 947.

Fire Insurance—Payment by Companies to London Fire Brigade, *Apr. 10*, 195.

Immigrants, Poll Tax on, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 976.

Lead Poisoning, Medical Examinations for Discovering—Letter from Dr. Shufflebotham, *Apr. 23*, 1566.

Liquor Traffic—Children Taken into Public Houses—Reports Received, *Apr. 22*, 1329.

Magistrates—Adjudications by Justices and Stipendiary Magistrates, *Apr. 16*, 768.

Mines, Metalliferous, Inclusion of, in Scope of Inquiry, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 769.

Napsbury Asylum—Cost Per Bed, *Apr. 16*, 749.

Naval Dockyards, Paint Manufacture in—Application of Factories Act, *Apr. 16*, 767.

Newcastle-on-Tyne—West Jesmond Off-Licence Case, *Apr. 23*, 1566.

Police

- Expenditure on, *Apr. 15*, 572.
- Metropolitan
  - House of Commons Duty—Vote to Which Cost is Chargeable, *Apr. 9*, 81.
  - Library Fund, Subscription to, *Apr. 9*, 79.
  - Weekly Day of Rest, Increase of Force Required in Order to give, *Apr. 9*, 78.
- Mounted, Keeping of, by Local Authorities, *Apr. 17*, 961.

Police Superannuation Bill—Special Facilities for, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 202.

Poor Prisoners Defence Act—Proposals for Amendment of Rules, *Apr. 18*, 1148; *Apr. 23*, 1565.

Prerogative of Mercy, Principles governing Exercise of, *Apr. 11*, 366.

Prisons, Warders' Grievances—Proposals for dealing with matter, *Apr. 11*, 365.

Quarries—System of appointing Managers, *Apr. 23*, 1564.

Revolvers, Restrictions on Sale of, *Apr. 11*, 214.

Slate Quarries, Fatalities in—Information given in Report (1905), *Apr. 16*, 769.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*

Teddington Rate Collection System, *Apr. 22*, 1413.

Vaccination

- Exemption Certificates—Cases of
  - Green, E. J., *Apr. 8*, 16.
  - Hayles, R., *Apr. 18*, 1123.
  - Hill, C., *Apr. 15*, 575.
  - Moore, A. H., *Apr. 16*, 768.
- Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 768.

Yorkshire, Crime in—Proportion to Population, *Apr. 16*, 769, 770.

Youthful Offenders Bill, Facilities for, proposed, *Apr. 23*, 1564.

Glamorganshire

Schools—Effect of Special Religious Instruction Bill on Estimates.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 11*, 370, 371.

Glasgow

University, Foundation of James S. Dixon Chair of Mining in—Ordinance, Presented, *Apr. 17*, 923, 939.

Glen

Boat Cove Slip, Date of completing.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 1000.

Glencar

Potato Crop, Failure of—Regulations as to Supply of Seed Potatoes, etc.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 221, 222.

Gloucester

George Street Branch Post Office Extension, Increase in Estimate for.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 42; Mr. Harcourt, 43.

Gooseberry Mildew

Proposals for preventing Spread of.
Q. Mr. Beck; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 17*, 951, 952.

Gore-Booth Estate

Layng, E., Case of—Compensation paid on Surrender of Farm, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 10*, 224, 225.

Gortnacart

School—Decision as to New Premises.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1390.

Government Departments

[*See also Names of Departments, as* Post Office, etc.]

[*cont.*

Government Departments—*cont.*

Furniture for, Source of Origin of and Allocation of Contracts.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Apr. 8*, 56, 60; Harcourt, 60, 64; Mr. Cremer, 64.

Ireland, *see that title.*

Luncheon Rooms, Cost of Upkeep, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1550.

Passenger Lifts at, Estimate for.
Or. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr. 8*, 60, 61.

Saturday Half-holiday Regulations.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16*, 741.

Securities held by—Return Ordered, *Apr. 10*, 195.

Government Insurances and Annuities

Accounts (1906), Presented, *Apr. 8*, 5; *Apr. 15*, 566.

Grange Corner

Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1109, 1110.

Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill

c. Rep. Apr. 18*, 1102.

Great Central Railway Bill

Reports by Board of Trade, Presented, *Apr. 10*, 194; *Apr. 23*, 1545.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill

c. Rep. Apr. 19*, 1257.

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill

c. 2R.* *Apr. 11*, 329.
Rep. Apr. 19*, 1257.

Greek Loan of 1898

Accounts (1906–7), Presented, *Apr. 8*, 5; *Apr. 15*, 567.

Greenock

Prison Governorship, Qualifications of Warder promoted to.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 11*, 373.

Greenwich Observatory

London County Council Generating Station, Effect of.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11*, 348.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]

Cattle Slaughtering Methods, Legislative Proposals for Improving, *Apr. 15*, 606.

Navy—Engineer and Marine Officers, Report of Committee on Action proposed to be taken by Admiralty, *Apr. 9*, 79.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]

Canadian Intermediate Tariff with certain Foreign Countries, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1141.

China—Poppy Cultivation Area, Proposals for Restricting, *Apr. 16*, 766, 767.

Congo Free State

Administration—Charges in Reports of Mr. Jeffrey and Mr. E. Cartwright, *Apr. 11*, 361.

Lado Enclave—Period and Terms of Lease, *Apr. 18*, 1138.

Egypt

Agent-General, *Status* and Powers of, *Apr. 18*, 1138.

British Consular Service—Standard of Proficiency in the Native Language, *Apr. 11*, 364.

Cattle Importation — Precautions against Diseased Cattle, *Apr. 11*, 365.

Concessions Board, Constitution of, *Apr. 11*, 363.

Cromer, Lord, Resignation of—Statement, *Apr. 11*, 390–391.

Landholders—Penalties for Infraction of Rules, *Apr. 11*, 363.

Milk Supply, etc., Regulations for Preventing Adulteration, *Apr. 11*, 364.

Newspapers—Subsidies Granted to *Al Mokattam Al Wartan* and *Les Progres*, *Apr. 11*, 364.

Pharmacy Laws, Amendment of, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1140.

Secret Service, Sums Granted for, during Past Five Years, *Apr. 11*, 362.

Sugar, Refined, Royalty on, *Apr. 18*, 1140.

Germany

Hamburg—Destitute British Subjects Applying at Consulate for Relief, *Apr. 16*, 765.

Metz, Vaccination Regulations in, *Apr. 18*, 1141.

Hague Conference—Government Connection with Mission of Mr. Stead, *Apr. 9*, 81.

Honduras Republic—Service Required of Domiciled Foreigners during Disturbances, *Apr. 16*, 765, 766.

Japanese Pharmacopœia—Effect of New Edition on British Trade, *Apr. 11*, 334.

Macedonia

Budget, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 762.

Deaths by Violence (1906–7), *Apr. 16*, 763; *Apr. 22*, 1394.

[*cont.*

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- Mesopotamia Mineral Oil Deposits—Concessions Granted, *Apr. 18*, 1138.
- Morocco—Allocation of Contract for Tangier Public Works, *Apr. 23*, 1563.
- New Hebrides
  - Anglo-French Committee, Information as to, *Apr. 11*, 359–361 ; *Apr. 18*, 1139.
  - Native Labour, Conditions of Employing, *Apr. 18*, 1139, 1140.
- Opium Traffic
  - German Settlements in China, etc., Restrictions in, *Apr. 18*, 1137.
  - Suppression of—British Representation at Conference, *Apr. 11*, 362.
- Persia
  - British Consuls, Commercial Duties of, *Apr. 18*, 1138.
  - Yezd—Imposition of Tufangchari Tax, *Apr. 16*, 766.
- Siamese Concessions to France—Effect of Treaty on British Interests, *Apr. 16*, 764.
- Soudan
  - Khartoum Natives, Application of, for Establishment of Girls' Schools, *Apr. 16*, 764.
  - Land Acquired by Government—Price Paid, etc., *Apr. 16*, 763, 764.
- Sweden and Norway—New Treaty, Progress of Negotiations as to, *Apr. 11*. 362.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 98–110.

Guiana, British
- Silver Currency Shipped to, Profit on.
  - *Q.* Mr. O. C. Philipps ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 10, 11.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Annan River, Salmon Fishery Rights in—Case of T. Murray, *Apr. 11*, 374.
- Edinburgh Grassmarket, Legality of Proposal to hold Sheep Market in, *Apr. 22*, 1422.
- Education
  - Consolidation of Statutes, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1422.
  - Senior Students Training and General Education of, *Apr. 11*, 374.
- India—Army Chaplains, Regulations for appointing Presbyterians, *Apr. 11*, 352, 353.
- Port William Church Property, Allocation of, *Apr. 22*, 1423.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
- House of Commons Lobbies—Use of Electric Fans, *Apr. 17*, 962.

Gwynn, Mr. [Galway]
- Education Inspectors—Area of Duty of Mr. McMillan, *Apr. 17*, 998.

Haddock, Mr. G. B. [Lancs., N., Lonsdale]
- Army—Lieutenants-Colonel, Provision of Sum for increased Pay of, *Apr. 8*, 12.
- Attorney-General for Ireland—Clerical Assistance, Reason for Increase in Allowance for, *Apr. 9*, 82.
- Civil Contingencies Fund—Repayment, Date of Presenting Estimate, *Apr. 9*, 78.
- Hague Conference—Government Connection with Mission of Mr. Stead, *Apr. 9*, 80.
- Navy—Electric Light, Distribution of Reduction in Sum provided for, *Apr. 8*, 11.
- Police, Metropolitan, on House of Commons Duty—Vote to which Cost is chargeable, *Apr. 9*, 81.

Hague Conference
- British Delegates, Names of.
  - *Q.* Marquess of Lansdowne ; *A.* Lord Fitzmaurice, *Apr. 22*, 1344.
  - *Q.* Mr. Byles ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1412.
- Stead, Mr. W. T., Government Connection with Mission of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Haddock ; *A.* Sir E Grey, *Apr. 9*, 80, 81.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
- Accounts Department, Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances of, *Apr. 17*, 962.
- Africa, South—Garrison, Increase of Officers' Pay, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 207.
- Ammunition and Stores, Reserve of, *Apr. 16*, 757.
- Artillery—Reason for Transfer of Sergeant Henson, *Apr. 11*, 347.
- Autumn Manœuvres, Cost of, *Apr. 18*, 1118.
- Auxiliary Forces—Training of Eastern Command, Arrangements for, *Apr. 23*, 1560.
- Canned Foodstuffs—Report of Lieut.-Col. Hobbes on Chicago Packing Establishments, *Apr. 11*, 352.
- Chief Accountant of a Command, Position of, under Order of 1st February, *Apr. 22*, 1407, 1408.
- Colonial Conference—Facilities for Premiers to see Volunteer and Yeomanry Forces proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1114.
- Commissions granted (1898–1906), *Apr. 22*, 1406.
- Cost per Man under Present System and under New Scheme, *Apr. 11*, 346 ; *Apr. 22*, 1406, 1407.
- Duke of York's School—Accommodation at Chelsea and at Dover and Decision as to Disposal of Chelsea Site, *Apr. 22*, 1393.
- Economies, Method of effecting, *Apr. 16*, 757.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Germany, Labour Conditions in—Ability of British Workmen to Furnish Reliable Report after Six Weeks' Visit to Germany, *Apr. 22*, 1403, 1404.
- Guns
  - Conversion of 15-pounders—Effect on Ballistics, *Apr. 22*, 1392.
  - Velocity and Angle of Descent (British and German), *Apr. 18*, 1115.
- Kingston-on-Thames Barracks, Lavatory Accommodation in, *Apr. 16*, 752.
- Lieutenants-Colonel, Provision of Sum for Increased Pay of, *Apr. 8*, 12 ; *Apr. 18*, 1117.
- Limerick Barracks, Condition of, *Apr. 11*, 346.
- Malta Governor, Military Functions of, *Apr. 23*, 1559.
- Militia
  - Artillery, Norfolk and Suffolk, Training Proposals for, *Apr. 18*, 1115.
  - Northumberland Artillery—Place of Training, *Apr. 18*, 1130.
  - Royal Engineer Submarine Miners—Units disbanded since 1906, *Apr. 17*, 971.
- Nenagh Garrison, Memorial as to Removal of, *Apr. 18*, 1116.
- Officers
  - Appointments (1898–1903), *Apr. 15*, 588.
  - Promotions from the Ranks (1898–1903), *Apr. 15*, 587.
  - Reserve
    - New Scheme, Eligibility of Militia Officers under, *Apr. 22*, 1392.
    - Suspension of Training, *Apr. 22*, 1408.
- Order of 11th March, Effect of, *April 11*, 345.
- Ordnance Factories
  - Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances of, *Apr. 17*, 962.
  - Men employed (1884–1906), *Apr. 17*, 968 ; Correction to Figures given, *Apr. 19*, 1268.
- Probationary Scheme, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 756.
- Recruiting—Case of H. Hartney, *Apr. 15*, 588.
- Second Line
  - Adjutants, System of appointing, *Apr. 22*, 1378.
  - Estimates for Contingencies and Admistration, *Apr. 11*, 350.
  - Separation Allowance for non-Commissioned Officers, Proposals for *Apr. 11*, 351.
  - Uniforms, Cost of providing, *Apr. 8*, 13.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Sherwood Foresters—Resumption of Green Facings on Uniforms, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 208.
- Soldiers—Map-reading, Reason for omitting from Examination *Apr. 12*, 501.
- South African War Service of Auxiliary Forces, *Apr. 22*, 1378.
- Standing Committees
  - Effect of New Rules on existing Committees, *Apr. 15*, 727.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 175, 177 ; *Apr. 10*, 239, 257, 279 ; *Apr. 23*, 1629, 1670–1686.
  - County Associations, Formation of, *Apr. 18*, 1116.
  - Enlistment and Discharge, Provisions as to, *Apr. 17*, 971.
  - Financial Adviser and Staff for Expeditionary Forces, Proposals for, *Apr. 22*, 1408.
  - Militia and Volunteer Officers, Effect on, *Apr. 10*, 211.
  - Standing Committee, Proposal for Consideration by, *Apr. 22*, 1403.
- Tidworth Barracks Hospital, Date of Building, *Apr. 18*, 1115.
- Tidworth Camp—Accommodation for Married Officers, *Apr. 16*, 753.
- Volunteers
  - Brigade Majors, Expenses of—Consideration of Report and Decision as to Increase of Pay, *Apr. 11*, 351.
  - Buildings, Drill-halls, etc., Value of, *Apr. 15*, 578, 589.
  - Financial Liability
    - Consent to Transfer of, *Apr. 15*, 578.
    - Position of Commanding Officer on Disbandment or Transfer of Corps, *Apr. 22*, 1405.
  - Lulworth Camp—Refusal of Permission to Young Men's Christian Association to Erect Recreation Tent, *Apr. 22*, 1393.
- War Office
  - Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances Granted to, *Apr. 17*, 962.
  - Contracts
    - Allocation to Ireland—Return as to Value, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 501.
    - Meat Contracts Allocated to Armour & Co., *Apr. 17*, 962.
  - Military Employees, Pension Claims of, *Apr. 22*, 1405.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Woolwich
  - Arsenal Discharges
    - Bonus, Regulations as to Payment of, *Apr. 16*, 757.
    - Inquiry and Discussion—Proposals for, *Apr. 15*, 589, 590.
    - Number Employed (1884–1906), *Apr. 17*, 968 (Correction to Figures given *Apr. 19*, 1268).
    - Reasons for, and Proposals for Obviating, *Apr. 10*, 210; *Apr. 11*, 352.
    - Statistics for 1907, *Apr. 22*, 1403.
  - Boxes of Ammunition awaiting Repair, *Apr. 18*, 1114.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
- Clare Lunatic Asylum Sewerage Scheme, Cause of Delay in Sanctioning, *Apr. 23*, 1567.
- Kilshanny—Reinstatement Application of Mrs. M. Organ, *Apr. 23*, 1573.

Halsbury, Earl of
- Judicature Bill, 3R., *Apr. 23*, 1539–1541.
- Statute Law Revision Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1537.

Harbour Authorities (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 18*, 1175.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
- Abyssinia—Legation House at Adis Abeba, Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 38.
- Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 59, 62.
- Bannockburn Field—Bore Stone, Steps taken for Preservation of, *Apr. 8*, 22.
- Blackfriars—Power Station for General Post Office, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 43.
- Blackpool, Post Office, Decision as to Erection of New Buildings, *Apr. 8*, 47, 48.
- British Cemeteries in Foreign Countries, Steps taken for Upkeep of, *Apr. 8*, 31.
- British Museum Reading Room
  - Closing of, *Apr. 8*, 67, 68.
  - Gold-leaf and Paint used in Re-decoration, *Apr. 22*, 1418, 1419.
- Buckingham Palace Stone Work, Removal of Paint from, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 21.
- Buildings, Public
  - Erection of, Criticisms on Policy as to, and Estimates for, *Apr. 8*, 47.
  - Insurance of, Information as to, *Apr. 8*, 59, 60.
- Charles Street, Arch over, Proposals as to, *Apr. 8*, 54.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*cont.*
- China—Amoy Consular Building, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- Duke of York's School Site, Disposal of—Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 16*, 749.
- Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, Vote for—Acquisition of Sites and Buildings and Works in connection therewith, Explanation of Items, *Apr. 8*, 37, 38.
- Edinburgh
  - Footpath between Holyrood Park and King's Park, Lighting of, *Apr. 8*, 70.
  - Holyrood Palace, Restoration of, Information as to, *Apr. 8*, 21, 23.
- Egypt—Consulate at Cairo, Increase in Estimate for Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 31, 41.
- France—Chancery of British Embassy in Paris, Estimate for Reconstruction of, *Apr. 8*, 41.
- Gloucester—George Street Branch Post Office Extension, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 43.
- Government Departments, Furniture for—Source of Origin and Allocation of Contracts, *Apr. 8*, 60, 64.
- Grand Committee, Accommodation proposed to be Allotted to, *Apr. 18*, 1162.
- House of Commons
  - Lobbies—Use of Electric Fans, *Apr. 17*, 962.
  - Newspaper Reading Room, Improvement in, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
- Houses of Parliament
  - Accounts, Separation of, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 71.
  - Furniture, Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 70.
- Hull, Post Office Buildings at, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 43, 50.
- Kensington Palace Orangery, Restoration of Carving, etc., *Apr. 8*, 20.
- Leadless Glaze, Adoption of, in Government Departments, *Apr. 12*, 497.
- Linlithgow Palace, Roofing of, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 69, 70.
- Mall to Charing Cross, Date of opening, *Apr. 8*, 64, 65.
- National Gallery Extension, Cost, etc., *Apr. 8*, 54.
- Orange Street Waterworks, Expenditure on, *Apr. 8*, 60.
- Osborne—Advisory Committee, Estimate for Travelling Expenses of, *Apr. 8*, 29.
- "Physical Energy" Statue, Progress made with Casting and Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 54.
- Royal Scottish Museum—Heating, Ventilating and Safeguarding against Fire, *Apr. 9*, 81, 82.

[*cont.*

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*cont.*
- Russia—British Embassy at St. Petersburg, Acquisition of, *Apr. 8*, 38.
- St. James' Palace
  - Fire Alarm Installation at, Particulars of, *Apr. 8*, 23.
  - Residential Apartments—Case of Mr. Kingscote, *Apr. 8*, 21, 25.
- Siam—Vice-Consulate Buildings in, Inadequate Accommodation provided, alleged, *Apr. 8*, 37.
- Spain—Embassy House at Madrid, Estimate for Acquisition and Alterations to, *Apr. 8*, 31.
- Stationery Office Warehouse, Cost of Erection, *Apr. 8*, 55.
- Sunderland, Customs Building at, Increase in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 43.
- Victoria and Albert Museum, Post Office opposite to, Condition of *Apr. 8*, 48.
- War Office Building in Pall Mall, Expenditure on decorating, *Apr. 18*, 1161.
- Windsor Park Lawn Mowers, Estimate for Erection of Sheds for, *Apr. 8*, 23.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Damask, Irish Linen, Powers of Board of Trade to compel Manufacturers to weave Name in, *Apr. 11*, 377.
- Member for Denbigh, Allegations as to Votes given by, in Support of the Government, *Apr. 11*, 388, 389.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
- Bills, referring to Standing Committees
  - Division of Bills into Two Parts, One for Consideration by the House, the other to go to Standing Committee Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 861, 862.
  - Money Bills, Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 421, 422.
  - Parliamentary Reform or Franchise, Exemption of Bills relating to, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 445.
- Committees
  - Grand Committees—Closure, Objections to granting Powers as to, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 669, 671.
  - Welsh Committee, Exemption from Operation of Rule, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 669–671.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
- Cabs—Negotiations as to Privilege Cab System, *Apr. 18*, 1123.
- Prerogative of Mercy, Principle governing Exercise of, *Apr. 11*, 366.
- Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for, *Apr. 11*, 375.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
- Army, Second Line
  - Estimates for Contingencies and Administration, *Apr. 11*, 350.
  - Separation Allowance for Non-commissioned Officers, Proposals for, *Apr. 11*, 351.
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 521–525.
- Gibraltar Dockyard Extension Scheme, Buildings Omitted from, *Apr. 11*, 348.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Effect on Auxiliary Officers, *Apr. 10*, 210.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin Harbour]
- Dublin Central Model School Fees, Amount etc., of, *Apr. 15*, 586.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]
- Income Tax on Earned Incomes—Pensions, Annuities, etc., Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1224.
- India
  - Municipal Elections—Eligibility of Government Officials as Candidates, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
  - Sind Magisterial Appointments—Protests against amalgamating with Revenue Department, *Apr. 23*, 1548.

Hartlepool
- Galley's Field Upper Standard School Rifle Corps, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 23*, 1569.

Haslam, Mr. L. [Monmouth Boroughs]
- Australian Import Duty on Trade Catalogues, *Apr. 16*, 744.
- Merchant Seamen's Wages, Payment of, under Allotment Notes, *Apr. 16*, 748.
- Newport (Mon.) Valuation of Licensed Houses in—Cause for Delay in Decision, *Apr. 19*, 1259.
- Postal Orders—Colonies in which payable, *Apr. 16*, 745.

Hawkhurst
- Auxiliary Postman Smith, Payment to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 773.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 56.
- Buildings, Public
  - Insurance of, Information as to, *Apr. 8*, 56, 59.
  - Sanitary Improvement of, Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 56.
- Government Departments, Furniture for—Source of Origin and Allocation of Contracts, *Apr. 8*, 56, 60.
- Hendon Vaccine Station, Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 56.

[*cont.*

Hay, Mr. C. G. D.—*cont.*

- London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22,* 1531.
- Orange Street Waterworks, Expenditure on, *Apr. 8,* 56, 60.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]

- Land Purchase Stock—Investment of Money raised, *Apr. 22,* 1430; *Apr. 23,* 1551.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]

- India—Survey, Duties and Salary of Mathematical Experts, *Apr. 23,* 1560.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]

- Civil Service Assistant Clerks in Dublin Offices, Salaries of, *Apr. 8,* 11.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, N., Lancaster]

- Buildings, Public, Erection of, Criticisms on Policy as to and Estimates for, *Apr. 8,* 45.

Helmsley, Lord [Yorks, N.R., Thirsk]

- Agriculture and Fisheries Board—Salaries of Staff, *Apr. 19,* 1259.
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
  - Colonies' Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of, etc., *Apr. 16,* 825.
  - King's Speech, Exemption of Bills referred to in, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 856.
  - Powers of the Crown or either House of Parliament, Bills modifying or taking away to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11,* 463–465.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]

- Aliens Act, British Subjects deported under, *Apr. 11,* 367.
- Blocking Motions and Bills, Proposals for preventing, *Apr. 11,* 377.
- Church Army Workshops, Application of Factory Act to, *Apr. 8,* 17.
- Sweated Industries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12,* 559.

Henderson, Mr. J. McD. [Aberdeenshire, W.]

- Prevention of Corruption Act—Liability of Agents of Foreign Firms Offering Secret Commissions, *Apr. 18,* 1154.

Hendon

- Vaccine Station at, Estimate for.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. Hay, *Apr. 8,* 56.

Herbert, Colonel [Monmouthshire, S.]

- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12,* 527.
- Liquor Licences, Renewal of—Reason for Delay in dealing with Appeals, *Apr. 23,* 1570.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9,* 169–172.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]

- Tidworth Camp—Accommodation for Married Officers, *Apr. 16,* 753.

Hervey, Captain F. W. F. [Bury St. Edmunds]

- Navy
  - Nucleus Crews, Working of System, *Apr. 17,* 1098.
  - Preparedness for War, *Apr. 17,* 1096.
  - Redistribution of the Fleet, *Apr. 17,* 1097.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Formation of County Associations, *Apr. 18,* 1116.

Hexham

- Parliamentary Election
  - Cause for Postponement of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. J. Robertson,; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 383, 384.
  - New Member sworn, *Apr. 9,* 83.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]

- Africa, East—Nairobi Magistrates, Powers of, to punish Natives for insulting White Women, *Apr. 15,* 593.
- Colonies, Employment of Coloured Policemen in, *Apr. 17,* 975.

Hillsborough

- Labourers' Cottages, Rents charged for—Representations as to New Cottages, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10,* 229.

Hire Purchase Agreements

- Stamp Duty to be imposed on
  - *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18,* 1255.

Historical Manuscripts

- Ancaster, Earl of—Report on MSS. Presented, *Apr. 8,* 4; *Apr. 15,* 564.
- Reports of Commission, with Dates of Issue, Appendices and Indices—Granting, proposed.
  - *Os.* Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Apr. 17,* 923; Earl Beauchamp, 924.
- Return Ordered, *Apr. 17,* 924.
- Stuart Papers—Copy of Calendar Presented, *Apr. 8,* 4; *Apr. 15,* 563.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hants, New Forest]
- Militia—Place of Training of Northumberland Artillery, *Apr. 18*, 1130.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Provision for Financial Adviser, etc., for Expeditionary Forces, *Apr. 22*, 1408.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1269.

Holland, Sir W. H. [Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham]
- Postage on Periodicals to Canada, Reduction of, *Apr. 15*, 607.

Holyrood Chapel
- *See under* Edinburgh.

Home Office
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
- *Under-Secretary*—Mr. H. Samuel.

Home Work Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 780.]

Homicide
- Punishment in Foreign Countries—Return Ordered, *Apr. 11*, 331.

Honduras Republic
- Domiciled Foreigners, Service required of, during Disturbances.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 765, 766.
- Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Hope, Mr. W. H. B. [Somerset, N.]
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, Evasion of, by Somerset Landowner, alleged, *Apr. 15*, 624.
- Children, Poor Law—Emigration to Canada in 1906, *Apr. 15*, 583.
- Wreckage, Finding of—Power of Tide-Surveyor to take Timber from Salvors *Apr. 18*, 1122.

Horniman, Mr. E. J. [Chelsea]
- Duke of York's School—Accommodation at Chelsea and at Dover and Decision as to Disposal of Chelsea Site, *Apr. 22*, 1393.

Horses
- Worn-out, Export of to Continent—Proposals for regulating Conditions of Transport.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 18*, 1164.

Hours of Labour (Bakehouses) Bill
- *c.* 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1099.

House of Commons
- *See under* Parliament.

House of Lords
- *See under* Parliament.

Housing of the Working Classes Bill
- Date of Introducing.
  - *Q.* Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 10*, 201.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
- Elliot Junction Railway Accident—Decision as to Remission of Sentence on Gourlay, *Apr. 11*, 372.
- Hull Railway Signalmen, Hours of Duty of, *Apr. 18*, 1155.
- Newcastle-on-Tyne—West Jesmond Off-licence Case, *Apr. 23*, 1565.

Hull
- Post Office Buildings at, Increase in Estimate for.
  - *Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 42; Mr. Harcourt, 43, 50; Mr. Carlile, 48.
- Railway Signalmen at Certain Level Crossings, Hours of Duty of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1155.

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill
- *c. Con.* Apr. 8*, 1.
  - 3R.* *Apr. 11*, 329.
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.

Humber Conservancy Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 734.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
- Civil Service Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Apr. 16*, 742.
- Coastguard, Proposals for Abolishing, *Apr. 18*, 1132.
- Colonial Conference 1907—Press Report of Proceedings, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1434.
- Education—Attendance of Children under Seven at School over a Mile away—Rule as to Exemptions, *Apr. 22*, 1416.
- Germany, Labour Conditions in—Ability of British Workmen to furnish Reliable Report after Six Weeks' Visit to Germany, *Apr. 22*, 1403, 1404.
- Navy
  - Casualties Return, Information given in, *Apr. 16*, 747.
  - Construction—Date of completing Certain Vessels, *Apr. 16*, 755.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1647–1658.

Imperial Institute
- Indian Section, Decision as to Future Position of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 8*, 12.

Imports and Exports
- *See* Exports and Imports.

Income Tax
- Abatement at End of Year of Assessment where it is found that Profits fall short of Average for previous Three Years, Repeal of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1204; *Apr. 22,* 1487.
- Collection in Scotland, Date of issuing Notices in
  - *Os.* Mr. C. E. Price, *Apr. 18,* 1236.
- Continuance of, at Rate of 1s. in the £
  - *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 22,* 1437.
- Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1203, 1204, 1205; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1216, 1217; Mr. G. Faber, 1224; Mr. S. Roberts, 1226; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1234, 1237; Colonel R. Williams, 1238, 1239; Mr. Bridgeman, 1240, 1241; Mr. Rawlinson, 1246, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1251; Mr. Morton, 1254; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22,* 1440; Mr. McKenna, 1456–1458; Sir C. Dilke, 1464; Mr. S. Wortley, 1469, 1470; Mr. H. Beach, 1491–1493.
  - Burden of Proof to rest with the Claimant and Claim to be made together with the Return, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1204; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22,* 1451.
  - Definition of "Earned Incomes."
    - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1203, 1225; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1217, 1218; *Apr. 22,* 1448–1454; Mr. McKenna, 1454–1456; Sir T. P. Whittaker, 1473–1476; Mr. E. Cecil, 1481; Mr. Asquith, 1487–1490.
  - Estimated Cost of the Scheme
    - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1207.
  - Pensions, Annuities, etc., Position of.
    - *Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 18,* 1217; Mr. Hart-Davies, 1224; Mr. Rees, 1227, 1228.
- Estimated Receipts from, for 1907–8.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1182, 1207.
- Evasion, Penalties for, Increase of, and Extension of Period of Recovery, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1204.
- Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1202, 1206; Sir C. Dilke, *Apr. 22,* 1463–1467; Mr. H. Beach, 1491.
- History of the Tax.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1200–1202.

Income Tax—*cont.*
- Married Persons, Cost of separately assessing Incomes of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Billson; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 11,* 333, 334.
- Permanency of, at 1s. in the Pound.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1199, 1202, 1206; Mr. Rawlinson, 1247, 1248; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22,* 1438–1441; 1445–1447; Mr. S. Wortley, 1471 Sir T. P. Whittaker, *Apr. 22,* 1471; Mr. E. Cecil, 1479–1481; Mr. Asquith, 1483, 1484.
- Receipts from, in 1906–7.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1179.
- Relation of Death Duties to Incidence of.
  - *Os.* Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 22,* 1490, 1491.
- Returns
  - Compulsory filling up of Forms, Proposals as to.
    - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1204; Mr. E. Cecil, 1482.
    - *Q.* Sir F. Dixon-Hartland; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 23,* 1555.
  - Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1204, 1231; Sir F. Banbury, 1231; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22,* 1447; Sir T. P. Whittaker, 1472, 1473.
- Unassessed Duty recovered in 1905–6.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 15,* 575, 576.
- Yield of, for 1906–7.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1198.

India
- Army
  - Chaplains—Regulations for appointing Presbyterians.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Gulland; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 11,* 352–354.
  - Kitchener, Lord, Extension of Period of Service.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 15,* 590, 591.
  - Medical Service, Information as to.
    - *Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22,* 1384.
- Bimlipatam, Decision as to Railway Extension to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 8,* 13, 14.
- Bombay
  - Municipal Elections, Official Interference in.
    - *Q.* Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 15,* 590.
  - Textile Factories—Date of Issue of Report.
    - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22,* 1399.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Bombay—*cont.*

Vihari Newspaper—Sentence on Editor for Publication of Seditious Matter.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 10*, 206, 207.

Budget, Date of taking and Facilities for Discussing.
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 11*, 352.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1172.

Comilla Riots, Information as to.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 16*, 757–759.

Deaths from Certain Infectious Diseases during last Thirty Years—Return Ordered, *Apr. 23*, 1545.

Education, Elementary, Proposal for Improving.
Q. Sir C. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 17*, 954, 955.

Educational Service, Promotion of Natives to.
Q. Mr. McCallum; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 18*, 1125.

Excise Committee Report—Return of Orders of Indian Government Ordered, *Apr. 18*, 1104.

Income and Expenditure (1895–1906)—Return Ordered, *Apr. 10*, 195.

Jamrud, Tribal Fighting near.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 17*, 954.

Lahore Disturbances—Proposals for Preservation of Peace.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 23*, 1561.

Legislative Councils, Report on—Opportunity for Discussion.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 11*, 211.

Loans raised in England—Return (1906–7), Presented, *Apr. 8*, 6; *Apr. 15*, 568.

Mayo College, Imperial Assistance to.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 15*, 591.

Municipal Elections—Eligibility of Government Officials as Candidates.
Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22*, 1383.

Plague

Deaths since 1896.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22*, 1383, 1384.

Medical Men on Special Plague Duty.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22*, 1384.

Precautions against.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 22*, 1384, 1385.

India—*cont.*

Punjab

Deaths from Tetanus in—Return Presented, *Apr. 10*, 194.

Land Alienation Bill, Object of, and Agitation against.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 16*, 759.

Railways

Proposals as to Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 18*, 1110.

Vizamgam-Malia Route, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 18*, 1124, 1125.

Sind Magisterial Appointments—Protests against Amalgamating with Revenue Department.
Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 23*, 1548, 1549.

Snakes

Poisoning, Deaths from (1876–1905)—Curative and Preventive Measures by Government, etc.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 11*, 342.

Rewards for Slaying, Discontinuance of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 15*, 584.

Survey—Duties and Salary of Mathematical Experts.
Qs. Dr. Hazel; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 23*, 1560, 1561.

Trade Journal, Information given in.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 8*, 13.

India Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Under-Secretary—Mr. C. E. H. Hobhouse.

Inland Revenue

Law relating to, Amendment of.

Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18*, 1256.

Supervisors, Examination of, since 1897.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1163.

Ireland

Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.

Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.

[*For* particular places, Estates, etc., *see their names.*]

Administration

Accounts subject to Partial Local Audit.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16*, 740, 741.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Administration—*cont.*

Legislative Proposals for Dealing with.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11*, 344.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 381.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Charitable Donations and Bequests—Meetings of Commissioners.
Q. Mr. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1399.

Constabulary Royal Irish, *see that title.*

County Councils, Cause for Deductions in Grants to and Notice given of Proposed Stoppages.
Qs. Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Farrell, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 619–623.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 750.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1379, 1380, 1425–1428.

Discussion, Opportunity for.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. Redmond, *Apr. 22*, 1431.

Education, *see that title.*

Evictions, Legislative Proposals for dealing with—Inclusion of Future Tenants proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 222, 223.

Financial Relations with Great Britain

Amount raised by Taxation in certain Years.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 8, 9.

Increase in Cost of Irish Services, Cause of.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 9, 10.

Government Departments

Cost of
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 940.

Return as to—Cause for Delay in Circulating.
Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 618.

Throwing Posts open to Competition, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 1002.

Government Institutions, Supplies Annually procured by, and System of calling for Tenders—Return ordered, *Apr. 10*, 194.

Labourers Acts and Cottages, *see title* Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

Land Commission, Land Judge's Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Law Courts, *see that title.*

Loan Fund Societies—Person authorised to Audit Accounts.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 585.

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Population (1841–1906).
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 9*, 76, 77.

Roman Catholic University—Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11*, 343.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11*, 375.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 381.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 776, 777.

Works Board

Character of—Statement by Dublin Chief Magistrate.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1167.

Clerks, Promotion System for—Case of Mr. Sidwell, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1424, 1425.

Religious Opinions of Officials—Correspondence with Mr. Williams, etc.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 10*, 231.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 623, 624.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16*, 778, 779.

Irish Provident Assurance Company

Inquiry into, Result of
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 22*, 1416, 1417.

Irish Tobacco Bill

c. Report from Standing Committee on Trade, *Apr. 17*, 1007.

Jacoby, Sir J. A. [Derbyshire, Mid.]

Vaccinated Veal, Purchase of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 614.

Jamaica

Banana Trade, Effect of Subsidy to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A*; Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 19*, 1261.

Loan and Grant, Decision as to
Qs. Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 15*, 594.

[*cont.*

Jamaica—*cont.*
Swettenham, Sir A., Reason for Resignation of.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Lyttelton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 212, 213.
Papers, Proposals as to Tabling.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 335.
Qs. Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18*, 1137.
Presented, *Apr. 18*, 1104; *Apr. 22*, 1342.

Japan
Pharmacopœia, Effect of New Edition of, on British Trade—Representations for Postponement of Importation Order, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Clarke; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11*, 334.
Tokio, House for Assistant Japanese Secretary at, Estimate for
Os. Sir G. Parker, *Apr. 8*, 32.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburgh]
Bombay Municipal Elections, Official Interference in, *Apr. 15*, 590.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 644.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
Merchant Shipping Act—Appointment of Advisory Committee, *Apr. 23*, 1554.
Navy—Obsolete Vessels, Sum Realised by Sale of—Weight and Value of Metal, *Apr. 16*, 754, 755; *Apr. 17*, 1096.

Johnson, Mr. J. [Gateshead]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr.12*, 511–516.

Joicey-Cecil, Lord J. [Lincolnshire, Stamford]
Army Reserve of Officers—Suspension of Training, *Apr. 22*, 1408.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Blocking Motions and Bills, Proposals for Preventing, *Apr. 11*, 377,
Buxton Garden Company, Case of, *Apr. 15*, 597, 598.
Chantry Trust — Powers of National Gallery Trustees, *Apr. 17*, 983.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvonshire, Arfon]
Mines, Metalliferous, Inclusion of, in Scope of Inquiry, proposed, *Apr., 16*, 769.

Jones, Sir D. B. [Swansea District]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Grants by, out of City Church Fund (1906), *Apr. 23*, 1571.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Anthrax Outbreaks—Measures taken to ascertain Source of Infection, *Apr. 18*, 1144, 1145, 1164.
Naval Promotion System, *Apr. 18*, 1131.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Army—Case of H. Hartney, *Apr. 15*, 588.

Judicature Bill
l. 3R., *Apr. 23*, 1539.

Jurors
Ireland—Power of Crown Solicitor as to Selection.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Apr. 17*, 961.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Agricultural Employment in certain Foreign Countries (1881, 1891, and 1901), *Apr. 22*, 1398.
Coal Production and Export in 1906, *Apr. 22*, 1418.
Company Donations to Political, etc., Societies—Return proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1417.
Imported Goods from certain Colonies in 1906, Duty on, *Apr. 22*, 1418.
Irish Provident Assurance Company Inquiry, Result of, *Apr. 22*, 1417.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1649.

Kennaway, Sir J. H. [Devonshire, Honiton]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill 2R., *Apr. 15*, 690.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Ballinagh, Upper—Reinstatement Claim of T. Forster, *Apr. 18*, 1128.
Bellamont Forest—Reinstatement Claim of T. Brady, *Apr. 23*, 1556.
Cootehill Labourers' Cottages—Reason for Rejection of Applications, *Apr. 23*, 1556.
Owengallis Cross Roads, Letter Box for, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1109.

Kensington Palace
Orangery, Restoration of Carvings, etc.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 8*, 19; Mr. Harcourt, 20.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. [Shropshire, Newport]
Bills referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 796–798.
Local Authorities—Powers as to Purchase and Holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 320–323.
Nenagh Garrison, Memorial as to Removal of, *Apr. 18*, 1115.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 255–263.

Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill
c. *Con.* Apr. 9,* 73.
3R.* *Apr. 12,* 493.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 15,* 561.

Kettering
Phthisis in, Compulsory Notification of, proposed.
Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15,* 604.

Kildare
County Council, Cause for Deduction in Grant to.
Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15,* 619, 622.

Land Purchase Arrears, Amount chargeable for.
Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22,* 1385, 1386.

Kilmarnock
Court House, Grant for improving.
Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 11,* 338.

Kilmorey Estate
Sale of—Amount of Negotiation Fee.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11,* 344.

Kilshanny
Reinstatement Application of Mrs. M. Organ.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 23,* 1573.

Kilsyth
Established Church Manse Repairs, Assessment of Dissenters for.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 17,* 953, 954.

Kincaid-Smith, Capt. [Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1642–1647.

King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill
l. *Rep.* Apr. 23,* 1533.

King's County
Agrarian Outrages—Condition of County, etc.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. H. Burke, Mr. Reddy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 17,* 990–992.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill
c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *Apr. 19,* 937.

Kingstown
Battery Plot, etc.—Treasury Minute sanctioning Sale Presented, *Apr. 23,* 1534, 1545.

Kingstown—*cont.*
Houses closed on certain Estates owing to Insanitation—Proposals for re-housing, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11,* 343.

Labourers' (Ireland) Act
Cottages, Sums proposed to be advanced for.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 998.

Inspectors, Qualifications of, and System of appointing.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 941.

Ladybower
School Facilities for Children of Navvies.
Qs. Mr. J. Ward; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 17,* 980, 981.

Lamb, Mr. E. H. [Rochester]
Canned Foodstuffs—Returned Military Stores sold in London when unfit for Food, Power of Local Authorities to deal with, *Apr. 8,* 8.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Devon S. Molton].
Coastguard, Proposals for Abolishing, *Apr. 18,* 1132.

"Dreadnought," Supply of Ammunition to, *Apr. 18,* 1132.

Engineer and Marine Officers, Report of Committee on—Action proposed to be taken by Admiralty, *Apr. 9,* 79.

Pensions—Case of H. Keeley, *Apr. 18,* 1133.

"Phœnix," Proceeds of Sale of, *Apr. 18,* 1132.

Promotion System, *Apr. 18,* 1131.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.W.]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12,* 535, 537.

Referring to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed, *Apr. 12,* 556.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
Clyde Fisheries—Herrings landed in 1906, *Apr. 19,* 1261.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
c. 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1649.

Report of Board of Trade—Ordered, *Apr. 23,* 1545.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Land Act, 1903
Sporting Rights, Regulations as to, Presented, *Apr. 9,* 75; *Apr. 15,* 566.

Land Commission (Ireland)
  [*See also* Names of Places and Estates].
  Proceedings—Return Presented, *Apr.* 9, 75; *Apr.* 15, 566.
  Rent Reductions during 1906–7.
    Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr Birrell, *Apr.* 23, 1574, 1575.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill
  c. 1R.* *Apr.* 17, 936.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr.* 17, 936.

Land Judge's Court, Ireland
  [*For* particular Estates *see their names.*]
  Purchases, Procedure in dealing with.
    Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr.* 17, 985.

Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
  c. 2R., *Apr.* 19, 1269.
  Debate on Second Reading [Commons] *Apr.* 19, 1269.
    Abolition of Right of Landlords to buy in under Market Price, proposed, 1277.
    Bonus to be in Inverse Ratio to Price, proposed, 1276, 1283, 1284, 1286, 1296, 1297, 1302, 1303, 1314, 1324.
    Compulsory Sale and Purchase of Land where no Agreement can be arrived at, granting Powers to Estates Commissioners, proposed, 1272, 1277–1279, 1286, 1297, 1298, 1301, 1309, 1315, 1328, 1330.
    Financial Arrangements in Respect of Land, Necessity for Inquiry into, 1285, 1286, 1322, 1323, 1329.
    Future Tenants, Right to fix Fair Rents to be conferred on, 1277, 1317.
    Grazing Lands, distribution of among Evicted Tenants, Powers of Compulsory Purchase, etc., 1271, 1272, 1273, 1282, 1283, 1315, 1316, 1323.
    Gravel, Sand, Stone, etc., to go with Land purchased, proposed, 1276.
    Land Purchase, Policy of, 1269.
    Mineral Rights, Ownership of, 1316.
    Price of Land—Increase in, under Zone System, 1270, 1288–1296, 1300, 1305, 1311, 1320, 1328.
    Refusal of Landlords to Sell Land Allegations as to, 1271, 1299, 1301.
    Sporting Rights to go with Fee Simple, proposed, 1275, 1316, 1324.
    Statutory Term, Reduction of, to Ten Years, proposed, 1276.
    Tenants' Improvements, Proposals as to, 1277, 1317.

Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill *—cont.*
  Debate on Second Reading—cont.
    Town Tenants, Acquisition of Property by, Proposals as to, 1275.
    Zone System, Abolition of, proposed, 1270, 1271, 1280, 1281, 1286, 1296, 1300, 1306, 1312, 1313, 1319, 1327.

Land Purchase, Ireland
  [*See also* names of places, Estates, etc.]
  Advances
    Return Presented, *Apr.* 9, 75; *Apr.* 15, 566; *Apr.* 16, 730, 736.
  Uneconomic Holdings, as Security.
    Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr.* 17, 986.
  Annuities
    Advantage of Redeeming at Present Price of Stock.
      Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr.* 15, 616, 617.
    Repayments under various Acts, Difference in Amount of.
      Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr.* 15, 617.
  Fund—Accounts and Report (1905–6), Presented, *Apr.* 8, 6; *Apr.* 15, 567.
  Guarantee Fund, Position of.
    Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr.* 22, 1374.
    Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr.* 23, 1551, 1552.
  Migrants provided with Farms, Necessity for Police Protection of—Evidence of Mr. Finucane.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr.* 17, 993.
  Prices—Financial Experts to test Soundness of Present System, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr.* 17, 985, 986.
  Stock
    Money raised by, Investment, etc., of.
      Qs. Mr. John O'Connor; Mr. Hayden, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. J. Redmond, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr.* 22, 1429–1431.
    Payment of Interest, Regulations as to.
      Q. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. John O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr.* 22, 1427–1429.
    Post Office Facilities for Payment and Transfer.
      Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr.* 22, 1432.
    Price of Issue of.
      Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr.* 11, 333.

Land Registry
  Grant to.
    Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr.* 8, 61,

Land Valuation Bills
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Findlay; *A.* Sir H Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 383.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash]
Agriculture Board—Proposals for Improving Office Accommodation, *Apr. 23,* 1570.
Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19,* 1282.
Royston—Case of Mr. O. B. Milne, *Apr. 10,* 216, 217; *Apr. 15,* 612; *Apr. 18,* 1159, 1160.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10,* 284–287.
Whitehall New Government Offices, Departments to be accommodated in, *Apr. 23,* 1570.
Yorkshire—Crime in Proportion to Population, *Apr. 16,* 770.

Lanesborough
Farrell, T., Purchase of Holding of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 11,* 376.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Hague Conference—Names of British Delegates, *Apr. 22,* 1344.
Magistrates and Justices, Proposed Alteration in System of Appointment—Alleged Preponderance of Conservative Magistrates, etc., *Apr. 22,* 1360–1364.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17,* 1047–1051.

Law Courts
Boilers, Estimate for Renewal of.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr. 8,* 61.
Ireland
High Court Posts on Chancery side for which Professional Qualifications are required.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 946, 947, 1001.
Supreme Court Service, Promotion System for Persons entering by open Competition.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 945, 946, 1001.
King's Bench Division Clerkships, System of filling.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Apr. 15,* 581.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
Alexandra Park
Betting Case, Decision in, *Apr. 17,* 977.
Races, Nuisance caused by, *Apr. 22,* 1414, 1415.

Lea, Mr. H. C.—*cont.*
Army
Commissions granted (1898–1906), *Apr. 22,* 1405, 1406.
Officers—Promotion from the Ranks (1898–1903), *Apr. 15,* 587.
British Museum Reading Room—Gold Leaf used in Re-decoration, *Apr. 22,* 1418.
Company Donations to Political, etc., Societies—Return proposed, *Apr. 22,* 1417.
Criminal Appeal Court, Establishment of—Suspension of Capital Punishment proposed, *Apr. 11,* 366.
Molascuit, Advantages of, *Apr. 10,* 217.
Osborne House
Sanitary Condition of, *Apr. 8,* 28.
Soldiers, Admission of, to Convalescent Home, proposed, *Apr. 8,* 27.
Paisley Magistrates' Order as to Alterations to Licensed House—Identity of Workmen, *Apr. 15,* 614, 615; *Apr. 22,* 1420.
St. James' Palace Residential Apartments—Case of Mr. Kingscote, *Apr. 8,* 19, 21, 25.
St. Pancras Unemployed Statistics (1906–7), *Apr. 10,* 214.
United States—British Representation at Opening of Carnegie Institute at Pittsburg, *Apr. 22,* 1412.
War Office Military Employees, Pension Claims of, *Apr. 22,* 1404, 1405.

Lead Poisoning
Medical Examination of Workpeople for Discovering Conditions of — Letter from Dr. Shufflebotham.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 23,* 1566.

Leahy Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18,* 1111.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]
Admiralty Administrative Policy, Criticisms on, Charges of Secrecy, etc., *Apr. 17,* 1092–1095.
Army Guns (British and German), Velocity and Angle of Descent, *Apr. 18,* 1114.
Cattle Slaughtering Methods, Legislative Proposals for Improving, *Apr. 15,* 606.
Navy
Cadets, Education of—Response to Appeal of First Lord, *Apr. 23,* 1559.
Classification of Ships—Reconsideration of Present System proposed, *Apr. 11,* 350.
Preparedness for War, *Apr. 17,* 1094.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9,* 172–183.

Legal Buildings
Vote for, *Apr. 8*, 68; *Apr. 9*, 190.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1617–1620.

Leicester
Poor Relief Statistics (1904–7).
Q. Mr. C. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 22*, 1395, 1396.
Unemployed Distress Committee, Tabling Correspondence with, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 10*, 215.

Leith of Fyvie, Lord
Pittsburg—British Representation at Opening of Carnegie Institute, *Apr. 22*, 1364.

Lever, Mr. A. L. [Essex, Harwich]
Auxiliary Forces—Arrangements for Training of Eastern Command, *Apr. 23*, 1560.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 287–289.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
Postal Deliveries on Early Closing Days, Arrangements for, *Apr. 22*, 1377.

Lewisham
Schools Joining Schools Rifle Association.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 23*, 1570.

Liddell, Mr. H. [Down, W.]
Damask Irish Linen, Powers of Board of Trade to Compel Manufacturers to Weave Name in, *Apr. 11*, 377.

Lights and Lighthouses
Devon and Cornish Coasts, Inquiry into Lighting of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15*, 602.

Linlithgow Palace
Roofing of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Apr. 8*, 68, 69; Mr. Harcourt, 69, 70.

Liquor Traffic
Children in Public Houses—Reports received
Q. Mr. Ferrier; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 22*, 1379.
Ireland, Legislative Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1169, 1170.
Legislative Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 16*, 753.
Licence Duties, Necessity for Revision of.
Os. Mr. C. Roberts, *Apr. 18*, 1231–1233.

Liquor Traffic—*cont.*
Licences, Renewal of—Reason for Delay in Dealing with Appeals.
Q. Colonel Herbert; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1570, 1571.
Revenue Derived from, in 1906–7, Increase in.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1178, 1179.

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *Apr. 23*, 1533.

Llanychan
School, Proposals as to Closing.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 17*, 981.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*The President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon Boroughs]
Agricultural Labourers' Wages, Statistics as to, *Apr. 10*, 202.
Census of Production Act, Formation of Advisory Committees, *Apr. 18*, 1121.
Clare Lunatic Asylum Sewerage Scheme, Cause of Delay in Sanctioning, *Apr. 23*, 1567.
Coal Export Statistics for 1906, *Apr. 18*, 1153.
Colonial Conference—Navigation Conference, Resolutions Passed at, *Apr. 17*, 980.
Companies, Limited Number Registered in 1906, Amount of Share Capital, etc., *Apr. 11*, 368.
Damask, Irish Linen, Powers of Board of Trade to Compel Manufacturers to Weave Name in, *Apr. 11*, 377.
Emigration—Scottish Statistics, (1897–1906), *Apr. 17*, 978.
Exports and Imports
Dutiable Articles from the Colonies, Value of Importations in 1906, *Apr. 15*, 602.
Exported Manufactures, Incompleteness of Return as to, *Apr. 18*, 1153.
Germany—Hamburg
British Labourers going to and Returning from, *Apr. 11*, 369.
British Stevedores Employed at, since 1st March, *Apr. 17*, 979.
Hull Railway Signalmen, Hours of Duty of, *Apr. 18*, 1155.
Lighting of Devon and Cornish Coasts, Inquiry into, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 602.
London Municipal Society
Dock Companies, Legality of Subscription by, *Apr. 18*, 1148.
London and South Western Railway Company, Subscription by, *Apr. 15*, 599.
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R. *Apr. 22*, 1506, 1525, 1531.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
Merchant Seamen's Wages, Payment of, under Allotment System, *Apr. 16*, 748.
Merchant Shipping Act—Appointment of Advisory Committee, *Apr. 23*, 1554.
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, Proposals as to, *Apr. 15*, 601.
Newton Heath Railway Accident—proposals for Inquiry, *Apr. 11*, 369.
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1042–1047.
Effect of Clause 10, *Apr. 18*, 1155.
Memorandum as to Effect on Existing Acts, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 603.
Prevention of Corruption Act—Liability of Agents of Foreign Firms Offering Secret Commission, *Apr. 18*, 1154.
Railways
Fatal Accidents to Employees, Number of and Inquiries into, *Apr. 10*, 204.
Great Southern and Western (Ireland)—Languages Included in Clerks' Examinations, *Apr. 15*, 581.
London, Brighton & South Coast Trains, Lighting of, *Apr. 15*, 601.
Redditch Railway Signalman J. Canning, Hours of Labour of, *Apr. 15*, 600.
Tramways, Electric, Prevention of Accidents on—Inquiry into Brake Systems, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 368.
Wreckage, Finding of—Power of Tide-Surveyor to take Timber from Salvors, *Apr. 18*, 1122.

Local Authorities
Debt, Interest Payable, etc.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 18*, 1123.
Expenditure of, and Number of Persons Employed by, etc.
Qs. Mr. Walrond; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 18*, 1157.
Land, Powers as to purchase and holding of—Extension, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Toulmin, *Apr. 10*, 294–301; Mr. Walters, 301–306; Sir F. Banbury, 306–310; Mr. G. Roberts, 310–314; Dr. Macnamara, 314–320; Col. Kenyon-Slaney, 320–323; Mr. H. Cox, 323–325; Lord R. Cecil, 325.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 16*, 746.
Loans applied for, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 16*, 745.
Police, mounted, Regulations as to keeping.
Q. Mr. Seddon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 17*, 961.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
Parliamentary Secretary—Dr. Macnamara.
Vote, Date of taking.
Q. Mr. S. Wortley; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1170.

Local Government Board, Ireland
Public Analyst, Terms of Office of—Complaints against Sir C. Cameron.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1391.
Religious Denominations of Officials.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 228, 229.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 10*, 193.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 10*, 193.
*Rep.** *Apr. 18*, 1102.
3R.* *Apr. 19*, 1257.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 22*, 1342.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 12*, 493.
2R.* *Apr. 23*, 1543.

Local Loans Fund
Accounts Presented, *Apr. 15*, 568, 571.

Local Taxation
See Taxation, Local.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Bills, referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 793.

London
Unemployed—Statistics as to help given out of Grant, etc.
Q. Sir A. Spicer; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 8*, 7.

London, City of
Committee Allowance for Lunch—Inquiry into Expenditure of Fund known as City Cash, proposed.
Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Apr. 8*, 6, 7.

London Chamber of Commerce
Colonial Preference, Ballot for—Number voting, etc.
Qs. Mr. Seaverns; Mr. E. Cecil, Mr. A. Chamberlain; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 15*, 625.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
c. 2R., *Apr. 15*, 687.

London County Council (Money) Bill
1R.* *Apr. 16*, 733.

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill
l. 2R., *Apr. 17*, 922.

London Municipal Society
Dock Companies subscribing to, Circumstances and Legality of.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1148.
Subscription by London and South Western Railway Company, Legality of.
Qs. Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Myer, Sir E. Cornwall; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15*, 599, 600.

London Port and Docks Bill
c. 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1493.

London United Tramways Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 8*, 2.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
Aid, Grant, or Charges upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving, *Apr. 11*, 426.
Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 784, 787.
Class of Bills to be sent Upstairs, necessity for Definition of, *Apr. 11*, 426.
Committee, Welsh, Proposals as to Establishing, *Apr. 15*, 676.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 649–651.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1601–1611.

Longford
County Council, Cause for Deduction in Grant to.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 620.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Ballina Poor Law Medical Officer—Conditions of Appointment of Dr. I. Clarke, *Apr. 10*, 223.
Ballymote School Teacher, Speech made by, at Sligo—Cause for Infliction of Fine, *Apr. 15*, 576.
Crannagh Farm Tenants, Boycott of—Police Protection, etc., *Apr. 10*, 226, 227.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*
Gore-Booth Estate—Case of E. Layng, *Apr. 10*, 224, 225.
Education
Grants, Increase of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 577.
Protestant Management, New Rule as to Schools under, *Apr. 10*, 227, 228; *Apr. 17*, 995–997.
Elphin Disturbance of 31st March, *Apr. 10*, 228.
Indian Army—Period of Lord Kitchener's Service, *Apr. 15*, 590.
Lighting of Devon and Cornish Coasts—Inquiry proposed, *Apr. 15*, 602.

Lord-Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.

Lord Chamberlain
Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor
Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Aberdeen

Lord President of the Council
Earl of Crewe

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Ripon

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor*
Judicature Bill, 3R., *Apr. 23*, 1539, 1542.
Magistrates and Justices, Proposed Alteration in System of Appointment, alleged Preponderance of Conservative Magistrates, etc., *Apr. 22*, 1353–1360, 1363.
Rule Committee Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1538.
Statute Law Revision Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1534.

Lough, Mr. T.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Islington, N.]
Local Contributions to Education and Cost per Head of Population, *Apr. 12*, 498.

Lough Cutra
School—Hour of Attendance of Protestant Children.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19*, 1266.

Loughrea
Malicious Injuries, Compensation for—Decision in Appeals, etc.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 774, 775.

Lowe, Sir F. W. [Birmingham, Edgbaston]
  Bills, referring to Standing Committees
    Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 794, 795.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
  Rulings, *see under titles* Questions and Speaker.

Lunacy
  District Asylums, Discharge of Dangerous Patients from and Class of Persons admitted to.
    Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Apr. 22*, 1423, 1424.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
  Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1063–1066.

Lune Fishery Board
  Ingleton Angling Association, Reason for refusing Licence to.
    Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 9*, 82.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
  Bradford—Decision of Magistrate and Remarks of Clerk in Case of Mr. V. Ward, *Apr. 18*, 1147.
  Children, Poor Law—Boarding out Statistics, *Apr. 15*, 583.
  Coal Mines Eight Hours Bill, referring to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 556.
  Germany, Vaccination Regulations in Metz, *Apr. 18*, 1141.
  Hours of Labour (Bakehouses) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1100.
  Kitchen Committee—Purchase of Vaccinated Veal proposed, *Apr. 15*, 613.
  Magistrates, Political Opinions of—Proposals for Appointment of Liberals, *Apr. 17*, 1005, 1007.
  Vaccination
    Exemptions—Case of A. H. Moore, *Apr. 16*, 768.
    Hunt, Olive, Cause of Death of, *Apr. 18*, 1158.
    Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 768.
    Primary—Instruction as to Size of Vesicle, *Apr. 15*, 603, 604.
    Workhouses, Cost in, *Apr. 15*, 603.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devon, Tavistock]
  Spurious Sports Bill, Facilities for Passing in Order to Prevent Cruelty in Deer Hunting, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 754.

Lynch, Mr. H. F. B. [Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon]
  British Indians in the Colonies, Position of—Opportunity for Discussion, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
  China—Proposals for Restricting Poppy-Cultivation Area, *Apr. 16*, 767.
  Macedonia
    Budget, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 762.
    Deaths by Violence (1905-7), *Apr. 16*, 762; *Apr. 22*, 1393.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
  Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
    Colonies, Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of, or Relations with the Mother Country, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 823.
    Report Stage of Bills, Allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 842–844.
  Jamaica—Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 11*, 213.

McCallum, Mr. [Paisley]
  Indian Education Service, Promotion of Natives to, *Apr. 18*, 1125.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
  Bills, Referring to Standing Committee—Clauses relating to Money Grants, etc., to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 428.
  Edinburgh—Footpath between Holyrood Park and King's Park, Lighting of, *Apr. 8*, 69.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bills, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 122–130.

Macdonald, Mr. J. A. M. [Falkirk, Burghs]
  Navy—Manning Statistics, *Apr. 17*, 972.

MacDonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
  Colonial Conference, 1907—Exclusion of Australian State Premiers, *Apr. 15*, 592.
  Deer Forests in Scotland, Proposals for restricting Extension of, *Apr. 22*, 1421.
  Education, Secondary, Endowments available for, *Apr. 15*, 609.
  Eton, Winchester and Harrow Schools, Expenditure on, *Apr. 15*, 609.
  Income Tax—Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1251.
  Leicester Unemployed Distress Committee, Correspondence with, *Apr. 10*, 215.
  Moray Firth, Trawling in—Proposals for Legislation, *Apr. 22*, 1433.

[*cont.*

MacDonald, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
- Old-age Pensions—Government Proposals for dealing with the Matter, *Apr. 18,* 1250, 1251.
- Scottish Public Rights of Way, Protection of, *Apr. 22,* 1421.
- Sugar Duty, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18,* 1252.
- Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *Apr. 16,* 1249.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1593–1601.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Sligo, N.]
- Athenry Unlawful Assembly Case on April 4th—Sentences on Ringleaders, *Apr. 17,* 988.
- County Councils, Cause for Deductions in Grants to, *Apr. 15,* 619.
- Sligo Land Purchase Arrears, Amount deducted for, *Apr. 22,* 1389.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Tobacco Duty—Incidence of Charges, *Apr. 18,* 1143, 1144.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury.
- Africa, East—Inquiry into Portuguese Native Labour Recruitment, *Apr. 11,* 335.
- New Hebrides Native Labour, Conditions of Employing, *Apr. 18,* 1139.
- Orange River Colony Constitution—Delay in Issue of Letters Patent, *Apr. 15,* 592.
- Woodlands St. Mary Post Office, Position of, *Apr. 15,* 608.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*President, Board of Education* [Monmouth, N.]
- Attendance—Exemption of Children under Seven from attending School over a Mile away, Rule as to, *Apr. 22,* 1416.
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
  - Aid, Grant, or Charge upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving, *Apr. 11,* 416–418.
  - Clauses relating to Money Grants, etc., to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11,* 430.
  - Crown or Parliamentary Powers, Exemption of Bills modifying or taking away, proposed, *Apr. 11,* 457, 460.
  - Division of Bills into Two Parts, One for Consideration by the House, the other to go to Standing Committee, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 862.
  - King's Speech, Exemption of Bills referred to in, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 855.
  - Recommittal of Bills, Powers as to, *Apr. 11,* 418.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees —*cont.*
  - Report Stage of Bill—allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 835–837.
- Budget Proposals, Facilities for Discussion of, *Apr. 18,* 1254.
- Code, Date of Tabling, *Apr. 17,* 981.
- Committees, Standing
  - Closure, Proposals as to Granting Powers of applying, *Apr. 15,* 675.
  - Welsh Committee, Exemption from Operation of Rule, proposed, *Apr. 15,* 675.
- Elementary Schools, Information as to, *Apr. 15,* 610, 611.
- Eton, Winchester and Harrow Schools, Expenditure on, *Apr. 15,* 609.
- Fiscal Policy, Alleged Necessity for Alteration in Present System, *Apr. 22,* 1459.
- Glamorganshire Schools—Effect of Special Religious Instruction Bill on Estimates, *Apr. 11,* 371.
- Hartlepool—Rifle Corps of Galley's Field Upper Standard School, *Apr. 23,* 1569.
- Income Tax on Earned Incomes
  - Definition of Earned Income, *Apr. 22,* 1454–1456.
  - Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, *Apr. 22,* 1456–1458.
- Inspectors—Attitude in Cases of Dispute, *Apr. 11,* 372.
- Ladybower—School Facilities for Navvies' Children, *Apr. 17,* 980, 981.
- Llanychan School, Proposals as to Closing, *Apr. 17,* 981.
- Monmouthshire Schools, Voluntary—Salaries of Teachers, *Apr. 11,* 372.
- Non-provided Schools, Expenditure on (1904–6), *Apr. 18,* 1161.
- Nottingham University College—Constitution of Court of Governors, *Apr. 15,* 584.
- Royston School—Cause for Rejection of Mr. O. B. Milne's Application for Mastership, *Apr. 10,* 216, 217; *Apr. 11,* 372; *Apr. 15,* 611, 612; *Apr. 17,* 982; *Apr. 18,* 1159–1161.
  - Regulations for testing Efficiency of Teachers, *Apr. 23,* 1569.
- Schools.
  - Council and Voluntary, Accommodation in and Attendance at, *Apr. 10,* 205
  - Legislative Proposals for authorising Erection, *Apr. 18,* 1159.
- Secondary Education, Endowments available for, *Apr. 15,* 609.
- Secondary Schools attended by Well-to-do Children, Grants for, *Apr. 22,* 1416.

[*cont.*

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Taxation, Indirect—Absence of Remission from Budget Proposals, Alleged, *Apr. 22*, 1458.
- Welsh Department Officers, Control of Permanent Secretary over, *Apr. 9*, 78.

McKillop, Mr. W. [Armagh, S.]
- Charitable Donations and Bequests—Meetings of Commissioners, *Apr. 22*, 1399.

McMicking, Major G. [Kirkcudbrightshire]
- Territorial & Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 279–284.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*Parlimentary Secretary to the Local Government Board* [Camberwell, N.]
- Local Authorities' Powers as to Purchase and Holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 314–320.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Gortnacart School—Decision as to New Premises, *Apr. 22*, 1390.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
- Admiralty Contracts—Allocation to Irish Firms, *Apr. 23*, 1546.
- Agriculture
  - Amounts Voted for, *Apr. 12*, 500.
  - Labourers' Wages, Statistics as to, *Apr. 10*, 202.
- Agriculture Department, Grants to, and Amount of Endowment, *Apr. 19*, 1265.
- Barnmeen School House, Condition of, etc., *Apr. 10*, 229, 230; *Apr. 17*, 987, 988.
- Carrickfergus Head Rents, Purchase of, *Apr. 18*, 1167.
- Census—Statistics (1841 and 1906) for England and Wales, *Apr. 12*, 499.
- Civil Government, Cost of, *Apr. 8*, 10.
- Civil Service Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Apr. 16*, 742.
- Constabulary, Cost and Number of, *Apr. 15*, 576; *Apr. 16*, 751.
- Dublin Metropolitan Police, Cost of, *Apr. 15*, 576.
- Education
  - Grants and Cost in Scotland, *Apr. 12*, 497.
  - Local Contributions to, and Cost per Head of Population, *Apr. 12*, 498.
- Emigration—Irish Statistics for each Province since 1841, *Apr. 19*, 1264.
- Financial Relations with Great Britain
  - Amount raised by Taxation in certain Years, *Apr. 8*, 8.
  - Increase in Cost of Irish Services, Cause of, *Apr. 6*, 9.
  - Sums voted for certain Services, *Apr. 15*, 571.

MacVeagh, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Government Departments
  - Cost of, in Ireland, *Apr. 17*, 940.
  - Saturday Half-Holiday, Arrangements, *Apr. 16*, 741.
  - Throwing Posts open to Competition proposed, *Apr. 17*, 1002.
- Hillsborough Labourers' Cottages, Rents charged for, *Apr. 10*, 229.
- Law Courts—System of filling King's Bench Division Clerkships, *Apr. 15*, 581.
- Loan Fund Societies—Person authorised to audit Accounts, *Apr. 15*, 585.
- Local Government Board Officials, Religious Opinions of, *Apr. 10*, 228.
- Parkmore and Red Bay Road, Improvement of, *Apr. 15*, 585.
- Police
  - Expenditure on, *Apr. 15*, 572.
  - Services in Scotland
    - Grants for, *Apr. 12*, 497.
  - Statistics for, *Apr. 16*, 747.
- Population of Scotland and Ireland in 1841 and 1906, *Apr. 9*, 76; *Apr. 16*, 737.
- Railway Clerks' Examinations in Great Southern and Western Company, Languages included in, *Apr. 15*, 581.
- Taxation
  - Irish Contribution in 1801–2, *Apr. 19*, 1263.
  - Rateable Valuation and Collection of Income-Tax per Head in Ireland, *Apr. 17*, 942.
- War Office Contracts allocated to Ireland—Return as to Value, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 501; *Apr. 23*, 1557.
- Works Board—Correspondence with Mr. Williams as to Religious Opinions of Clerks, *Apr. 10*, 231; *Apr. 15*, 623.

Macedonia
- Budget, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lynch; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 762.
- Deaths by Violence (1905–7).
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 762, 763; *Apr. 22*, 1393, 1394.

Macroom
- Petty Sessions—Chairmanship of Mr. O'Hara.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1112.
- Resident Magistrate, Mr. O'Hara, Warrant issued by in connection with Ballingeary Disturbance.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1386.

Madden Estate
Reinstatement Claim of Mr. R. Maloney.
Q. Mr. O'Mara ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1129.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Old-Age Pensions—Government Proposals for dealing with the matter, *Apr. 18*, 1244, 1245.
Sugar Duty, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1244.

Magistrates
Appointments by Lords-Lieutenant—Proposals for Alteration of System, Alleged Preponderance of Conservative Magistrates, etc.
Os. Marquess of Bath, *Apr. 22*, 1344–1353 ; Lord Loreburn, 1353–1360, 1363 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1360–1364.
Qs. Mr. Lupton, Mr. A. S. Wilson Mr. Bowles, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Bridgeman ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *Apr.* 17, 1005–1007.
Justices and Stipendiary Magistrates, Adjudications by.
Q. Mr. J. Ward ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 768.

Maidstone Gas Bill
c. *Con.* Apr. 8*, 1.
3R.* *Apr. 11*, 329.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.

Mall to Charing Cross Improvement
Date of Opening.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8*, 64, 65.

Malta
Civil Governor, Proposals as to appointing.
Q. Sir F. Banbury ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
Governor, Military Function of.
Q. Mr. Ashley ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 23*, 1559.
Mediterranean Defence, Opinions of Military Authorities on.
Qs. Mr. Ashley ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 17*, 1007.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 734.

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 733.

Manchester Ship Canal (Various Powers) Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 22*, 1369.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
Dairies, Regulations for Control and Inspection of, *Apr. 15*, 605.
Tuberculosis, Bovine—Compulsory Notification of Disease in Cows, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 950.
Workhouses—Purity of Milk Supply for Children, *Apr. 17*, 948.

Marriages
General Abstract (England and Wales) Presented, *Apr. 12*, 495 ; *Apr. 15*, 566.
Scottish Laws, Revision of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Watt ; *As.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Apr. 17*, 952, 953.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *Apr. 22*, 1342.

Mauritius
Bacteriological Institute, Date of establishing.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 354.
Legislative Council, Increase of Elective Element in—Representations received.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 354.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
Post Office Stores in Ireland—Appointment of Controller, *Apr. 18*, 1168.

Meat
Inspection in Scotland—Result of Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. Watt ; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1378, 1379.

Medway Lower Navigation Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 8*, 2.
Rep. Apr. 18*,
3R.* *Apr. 22*, 1368.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's County, Leix]
Barrow River Drainage Proposals, *Apr. 10*, 219, 220.
Dublin Registry of Deeds Office—Memorial as to Increase of Salaries, *Apr. 10*, 231.
Sandford Wills Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Apr. 17*, 983.

Members of Parliament
Denbigh, Member for, Allegations as to Votes given by, in Support of the Government.
Personal Explanation [Mr. C. Edwards] *Apr. 11*, 385–389 ; *Apr. 22*, 1435.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, *Apr. 11*, 388, 389 ; Mr. Speaker, Lord R. Cecil, 389, 390.

Merchandise Marks Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee on Trade, *Apr. 15*, 626.

Merchant Shipping
[*For* particular Vessels *see their names.*]
Statistical Return as to Vessels Entering and Clearing Certain Ports in 1906, Ordered, *Apr. 16*, 736.
Wages of Seamen—Regulations for Payment, under Allotment Notes.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 16*, 748.

Merchant Shipping Act, 1906
Advisory Committee, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. Jenkins; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 23*, 1554.

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15*, 601.

Mesopotamia
Mineral Oil Deposits—Concessions granted.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1138.

Meteorological Office
Estimate for.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *Apr. 8*, 61.

Metropolitan Cattle Market
Accounts (1906) Presented, *Apr. 8*, 4; *Apr. 15*, 567.

Mexican Isthmus
Tehuantepec Railway—Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Stafford, Handsworth]
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1041.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
Chantry Trust — Powers of National Gallery Trustees, etc., *Apr. 17*, 982, 983.

Middlesbrough Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 16*, 729.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 17*, 938.

Midwives Act
Training Schools Approved by Board, Fees Paid by Probationers, etc.
Q. Mr. Ashton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 18*, 1124.

Militia
Norfolk and Suffolk Artillery, Training Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1115.
Northumberland Artillery, Place of Training of.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1130.

Militia—*cont.*
Royal Engineer Submarine Miners—Units Disbanded since 1906.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17*, 971.
Units—Return (1906) Presented, *Apr. 15* 562.

Mines
Metalliferous, Inclusion of, in Scope of Inquiry, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Jones; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 769.
Reports of Inspectors (1906) Presented, *Apr. 19*, 1258; *Apr. 22*, 1342.

Mint
Profits from, Increase in during 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1177, 1178.

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill
c. 3R.* *Apr. 8*, 1.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.

Mitchell-Thompson, Mr. W. [Lanark, N.W.]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills to Create Subordinate Legislature, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 789–791.
Canadian Coasting Trade—Resolutions of Navigation Conference, *Apr. 17*, 975.
Coastguard
Proposals for Reduction, *Apr. 22*, 1402.
Stations closed during past Twelve Months, *Apr. 17*, 971.
Colonial Conference—Resolutions Passed at Navigation Conference, *Apr. 17*, 980
Honduras Republic—Service Required of Domiciled Foreigners during Disturbances, *Apr. 16*, 765.
Jamaica Loan and Grant, Decision as to, *Apr. 15*, 594.
Nigeria, Northern, Railway Construction in, *Apr. 17*, 974.
Persia—Imposition of Tufangchari Tax at Yezd, *Apr. 16*, 766.
Spirit, Colonial, Imported for Methylating —Incidence of Duty, *Apr. 18*, 1143.

Molascuit
Advantages of—Making known to Stockowners, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 10*, 217, 218.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1027–1030.
Effect of Clause 10, *Apr.* 18, 1154.

Money, Mr. L. G. Chiozza [Paddington, N.]
Church Army Workshops, Application of Factory Act to, *Apr. 8*, 17, 18.
Imports of Dutiable Articles from the Colonies in 1906, *Apr. 15*, 602.

[*cont.*

Money, Mr. L. G. Choizza—*cont.*
  Revenue and Expenditure—Form of Financial Statement, *Apr. 15*, 596.
  Woolwich Arsenal Discharges, Reason for and Proposals for Obviating, *Apr. 10*, 210.

Monmouthshire
  Schools, Voluntary—Salaries of Teachers. *Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 11*, 372.

Montgomery, Mr. H. G. [Somerset, Bridgewater]
  Vaccination Exemption Case of Mr. C. Hill, *Apr. 15*, 575.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Newry]
  Government Departments in Ireland—Cause for Delay in Circulating Report, *Apr. 15*, 618.
  Yorkshire, Crime in—Proportion to Population, etc., *Apr. 16*, 769, 770.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
  Companies, Limited—Number Registered in 1906, Amount in Share Capital, etc., *Apr. 11*, 368.

Moray Firth
  Trawling in
    British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Trawlers, Reason for Prosecuting.
      Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. A. S. Wilson, Sir G. Doughty; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1165–1167.
    Foreign Vessels Reported and Prosecuted.
      Qs. Mr. A. S. Wilson, Mr. Pirie; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 15*, 615, 616.
    Legislation, Proposals as to.
      Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. A. S. Wilson; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 22*, 1433, 1434.
    "Lucania," Case — Nationality of Vessel.
      Q. Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 15*, 616.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose, Burghs]
  Afghanistan—Cost of Amir's Visit to India, *Apr. 22*, 1398.
  Army
    Chaplains—Regulations for Appointing Presbyterians, *Apr. 11*, 354, 355.
    Kitchener, Lord, Period of Service of, *Apr. 15*, 591.
    Medical Service, Information as to, *Apr. 22*, 1384.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J—*cont.*
  Bimlipatam, Decision as to Railway to, *Apr. 8*, 14.
  Bombay
    Municipal Elections, Official Interference in, *Apr. 15*, 590.
    Textile Factories—Date of Issue of Report, *Apr. 22*, 1399.
    Vihari Newspaper—Sentence on Editor for Publication of Seditious Matter, *Apr. 10*, 207.
  British Indians in the Colonies, Position of—Opportunity for Discussion, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
  Budget, Date of taking, *Apr. 11*, 352.
  Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 10*, 231, 232.
  Comilla Riots, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 758, 759.
  Education, Elementary, Proposals for Improving, *Apr. 17*, 955.
  Educational Service, Promotion of Natives to, *Apr. 18*, 1125.
  Imperial Institute, Indian Section, Decision as to Future Position of, *Apr. 8*, 12.
  Jamrud, Tribal Fighting near, *Apr. 17*, 954.
  Lahore Disturbances—Measures taken to Preserve Peace, *Apr. 23*, 1561.
  Legislative Councils, Discussion of Report on, *Apr. 11*, 211.
  Mayo College, Imperial Assistance to, *Apr. 15*, 591.
  Municipal Elections—Eligibility of Government Officials as Candidates, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
  Opium
    Bengal Opium Available for Export, *Apr. 11*, 341.
    Indian Exports in 1906, Value of—Amount sent to China, *Apr. 10*, 207.
    Trade with China, Proposals of Government with Regard to, *Apr. 11*, 352.
  Plague, Precautions against—Deaths since 1896, and Number of Medical Men on Special Duty, *Apr. 22*, 1384, 1385.
  Punjab Land Alienation Bill, Object of and Agitation against, *Apr. 16*, 759.
  Railways
    Inquiry, Proposals for, *Apr. 18*, 1110.
    Vizamgam-Malia Route, Decision as to, *Apr. 18*, 1125.
  Sind Magisterial Appointments—Protests Against Amalgamating with Revenue Department, *Apr. 23*, 1549.

[*cont.*

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Snakes
Discontinuance of Reward for Killing proposed, *Apr. 15*, 584.
Poisoning, Deaths from (1876–1905), *Apr. 11*, 242.
Survey—Duties and Salary of Mathematical Experts, *Apr. 23*, 1560, 1561.
Trade Journal, Information Given in, *Apr. 8*, 13.

Morocco
Tangier Public Works, Allocation of Contract for.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 23*, 1563.

Morrogh Bernard Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1392.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]
Adjournment of the House, Objections to, *Apr. 8*, 72.
Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 58.
Budget Proposals, Facilities for Discussion, *Apr. 18*, 1254.
Cemeteries, British, in Foreign Countries, Steps Taken for Upkeep of, *Apr. 8*, 30, 40.
China—Increase in Estimate for Consular Building at Amoy, *Apr. 8*, 40.
Edinburgh
Holyrood Palace, Restoration of, *Apr. 8*, 19, 22, 24.
Law Courts, Improvement of, *Apr. 8*, 57.
Education—Meeting of Lords of Committee of Privy Council, *Apr. 11*, 380, 381.
Egypt—Consulate at Cairo, Increase in Estimate for Erection of, *Apr. 8*, 30, 40.
Estimates, Scottish, Days Allotted to, *Apr. 22*, 1433.
France—Chancery of British Embassy in Paris, Estimate for Re-construction of, *Apr. 8*, 40.
Income Tax on Earned Incomes not Exceeding £2,000 to be 9d. in the Pound, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1254.
Linlithgow Palace, Roofing of, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 68, 69.
National Debt—New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 18*, 1253.
Osborne Advisory Committee, Estimate for Travelling Expenses of, *Apr. 8*, 29.
Osborne House—Soldiers, Admission of, to Convalescent Home, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 26.

Morton, Mr. A. C.—*cont.*
Parliament, Houses of—Estimate for Furniture, *Apr. 8*, 70.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Termination of Proceedings on—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 662–664.
Post Office—Cost of Scottish Services in Certain Years, *Apr. 23*, 1568.
St. James' Palace, Residential Apartments—Case of Mr. Kingscote, *Apr. 8*, 20.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Date of Taking Second Reading, *Apr. 23*, 1578.
Spain—Embassy House at Madrid, Estimate for Acquisition and Alterations to, *Apr. 8*, 30.
Sugar Duty, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1253.

Motors
Taxation of, Additional, proposed.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1197.

Mullaghgarrow
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. Crawford.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 584, 585.

Municipal Representation Bill
l. 2R., *Apr. 16*, 731.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
Morrogh Bernard Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 22*, 1392.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
London Municipal Society, Subscription to by London and South Western Railway Company, *Apr. 15*, 600.

Napsbury
Asylum—Cost Per Bed.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 749.

National Debt
Funded Debt, Position of 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1183.
Law Relating to, Amendment of, *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18*, 1256.
New Sinking Fund, Addition to out of Surplus Revenue.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1210; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1212; Mr. G. Faber, 1220; Mr. S. Roberts, 1226; Sir F. Banbury, 1229; Mr. Morton, 1253; Sir T. P. Whittaker, *Apr. 22*, 1476.
Permanent Annual Charge
Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18*, 1256.
Reduction of.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1184.
Amount Allocated for (1907–8).
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1185.

[*cont.*

National Debt—*cont.*
Reduction of—*cont.*
Sum of £500,000 diverted from to pay for Financial Liabilities of Volunteers.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 18,* 1212, 1213.

South African War Debt, Position of.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1184; Col. R. Williams, 1238.

Terminable Annuities, Position of 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1183.

Unfunded Debt, Position of, 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1183.

National Physical Laboratory
Accounts (1900–1906)
Ordered, *Apr. 18,* 1105.
Presented, *Apr. 19,* 1258.
Tabling of.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15,* 612, 613.

National Galleries of Scotland
Allocation of certain Sums out of General Fund—Order Presented, *Apr. 8,* 5, *Apr. 15,* 568.

Trustees, etc., Order as to, Presented, *Apr. 8,* 5; *Apr. 15,* 568.

National Gallery
Chantry Trust, *see that title.*
Extension of, Cost, etc.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 8,* 53; Mr. Harcourt, 54.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

"Agamemnon" and "Lord Nelson," Reserve Guns for.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 10,* 209.

Battleships, *see also subheadings* names of Ships.
"Dreadnought" Type, Advantages and Disadvantages of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Apr. 17,* 925, 926; Lord Ellenborough, 928; Lord Tweedmouth, 932.

Repairs to—Statement of First Lord.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 17,* 1072, 1073.

Statistics as to Number laid down and Number struck off List.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 10,* 196.

"Blake" and "Blenheim," Classification of.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11,* 350.

Navy—*cont.*
Cadets' Education, Cost of—Contribution required from Parents.
Qs. Mr. Walker, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 23,* 1558, 1559.

Casualties Return, Information given in.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 16,* 747.

Classification of Ships—Reconsideration of Present System, proposed.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11,* 350.

Cruisers—Type best suited for Scouting, etc.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Apr. 17,* 926, 927.

Dockyards, *see also subheadings,* names of Dockyards.
Paint and Colour Manufacture in—Application of Factories Act, etc.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16,* 767.

Stoppages for Time lost, Regulations as to.
Q. Sir J. Benn; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 23,* 1546.

Domestics, Inquiry into and Decision.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15,* 582.

Douglas Committee, Dissatisfaction with Proceedings of.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 17,* 1069.

"Dreadnought."
Ammunition, alleged Delay in Supplying.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 18,* 1131, 1132.

Cost of—Reason for Exclusion of Cost of Reserve of Guns.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 10,* 208, 209.

Electric Light, Distribution of Reduction in Sum provided for.
Q. Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 8,* 11, 12.

Engineer and Marine Officers, Report of Committee on—Action proposed to be taken by Admiralty.
Q. Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 9,* 79.

Fleets of Great Britain and Foreign Countries—Return ordered, *Apr. 9,* 76.

Foreign Countries, Shipbuilding Programme of.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17,* 973.

Gunnery Prizes, Expenditure on, during last Three Years.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15,* 573.

"Invincible," Cost of.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 10,* 208.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Manning Statistics.
Q. Mr. M. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 972.

Merchant Cruisers, Value of, as Auxiliaries in Time of War—Policy of subsidising.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Apr. 17*, 927, 928; Lord Tweedmouth, 933.

Metal on Ships, Means of calculating Weight of.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 22*, 1382.

Mobilisation of Ships on 14th June, Misleading Statements as to.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr 17*, 1073.

Nore Fleet, Efficiency of Crews, Training Proposals, etc.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *Apr. 17*, 1079.

Nucleus Crews, Working of System.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 17*, 1070; Captain Hervey, 1098.

Obsolete Ships, Price obtained for—Value of Metal, etc.
Os. Mr. Jenkins, *Apr. 17*, 1096.
Qs. Mr. Jenkins; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 16*, 754, 755.

Officers with Brevet Rank serving in Sea-going Ships—Pay given, etc.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 22*, 1401, 1402; *Apr. 23*, 1548, 1559.

Osborne College, *see that title.*

Pensions

Keely, H., Case of.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 18*, 1132, 1133.

System of calculating.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 347.

"Phœnix," Proceeds of Sale of, etc.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 18*, 1132.

Plumbers, Pay of
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 16*, 739.

Policy as to
Os. Lord Brassey, *Apr. 17*, 925; Lord Tweedmouth, 930; Earl Cawdor, 934.

Portsmouth Dockyard

Chargemen, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 23*, 1553.

Ship Fitters' Assistants, Present Employment of.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 23*, 1546, 1547.

Preparedness for War.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 1091; Mr. A. Lee, 1094; Captain Hervey, 1096.

Navy—*cont.*

Promotion System in—Promotions from Royal Yacht.
Qs. Mr. Jowett, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 18*, 1131.

Ratings Committee Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15*, 582.

Redistribution of the Fleet.
Os. Captain Hervey, *Apr. 17*, 1097.

Repairs, Provision for.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 1091.

Rosyth Works, Progress made with.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15*, 586.

Scouts, Efficiency of Present Type.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Apr. 17*, 927; Lord Ellenborough, 928.

Shipbuilding

Cost of Battleships and Cruisers to be completed by 1909.
Q. Mr. Nuttall; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 10*, 208.

Date of Completion of certain Vessels.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 16*, 755.

Fluctuation of Programmes, Objections to.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 17*, 1074.

Foreign Programmes

Cruisers, Policy as to.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *Apr. 17*, 1080.

German Programme, Alleged Mis-Statement by Secretary to the Admiralty.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 1088; Mr. Bellairs, 1091.

Programme 1907–8.

Battleship and Cruisers, Policy as to.
Os. Lord Brassey, *Apr. 17*, 924–928; Lord Tweedmouth, 931–933.

Information as to.
Q. Mr. Nuttall; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 16*, 755, 756.

Tonnage of New Battleships, Reason for Increase in.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 973, 974.

Shore Appointments held by Executive Engineer Officers.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 11*, 349, 350.

Special Service Vessels, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15*, 574.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Stokehold Boots, Result of Experiment as to issue of.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 15*, 583.
Strength
Relative Strength in Battleships of Great Britain and Foreign Powers.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *Apr. 17*, 1078.
Two-Power Standard, Necessity for Maintaining.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *Apr. 17*, 934, 936; Mr. F. E. Smith, 1076–1078; Mr. E. Robertson, 1076, 1091.
Torpedo Ranges, Reason for Reduction in Estimate for.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 8*, 12.
"Truth about the Navy," Circulation of to Crews at the Public Expense.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *Apr. 17*, 1085; Mr. E. Robertson, 1090.
Volunteer Reserve, Men qualifying in Signalling, etc., Memorial as to Pay of—Order Presented, *Apr. 16*, 730, 736.

Navy Estimates
Method of Voting, Alteration of, proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Apr. 17*, 929; Lord Tweedmouth, 933.
Nucleus Crews, Alteration in Form of Vote for.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 17*, 972, 973.

Neath, Pontardawe and Brynaman Railway Bill
c. *Rep.* Apr. 10*, 193.
Con. Apr. 19*, 1257.
3R.* *Apr. 23*, 1543.

Nenagh
Garrison, Memorial as to Removal of.
Q. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1115, 1116.

New Caledonia
Trade Report, Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

New Hebrides
Anglo-French Committee, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Alden, Sir G. Parker, Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11*, 359–361.
Australasian Interests, Representation of.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 22*, 1410.
Date of Meeting and Terms of Reference.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1139.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1411.

New Hebrides—*cont.*
Liquor Traffic—Restrictions on Importation of Spirits.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 23*, 1561, 1562.
Native Labour, Conditions of Employing Proposals for Protection of Natives.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1139, 1140.

Newcastle-on-Tyne
West Jesmond Off-licence Case Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 23*, 1565, 1566.

Newport (Mon.)
Licensed Houses, Valuation of—Cause for Delay in Decision of Inland Revenue.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 19*, 1259, 1260.

Newquay and District Water Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 8*, 2.

Newton Heath
Railway Accident—Proposals for Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 11*, 368, 369.

Nicholson, Mr. C. N. [Yorks, W.R., Doncaster]
Woolwich, West Ham, Poplar and Leicester—Poor Relief Statistics (1904–7) *Apr. 22*, 1395.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Africa, East—Size and Nature of White Police Force, *Apr. 18*, 1134.
Grand Committee, Accommodation proposed to be allotted to, *Apr. 18*, 1162.
Panama Canal—Tabling Contract for Recruitment of, Trinidad Labourers, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 199.
"Phoenix," Proceeds of Sale of, *Apr. 18*, 1132.
Standing Order No. 18, Amendment of, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1170.

Nigeria
Railway Construction in Northern Territory.
Qs. Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 17*, 974, 975.

North East London Railway Bill
c. *Rep.* Apr. 18*, 1102.

North Eastern and Lancashire and Yorkshire Railways Bill
c. *Rep.* Apr. 18*, 1102.

Notification of Births Bill
c. Intro. and 1R.* *Apr. 23*, 1582–1584.

Nottingham
University College—Constitution of Court of Governors.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 15,* 584.

Nurses and Private Nursing Homes (Registration) Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 15,* 726.

Nuttall, Mr. H. [Lancashire, S.E., Stretford]
Bath Butter Adulteration Case—Percentage of Moisture shown in Butter by Analysis, *Apr. 11,* 372.
Naval Shipbuilding
Cost of Battleships and Cruisers to be completed by 1909, *Apr. 10,* 208.
Programme, Information as to, *Apr. 16,* 755.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas. [Wicklow, W.]
Dublin Postmen (ex-messenger Assistant), Position of, *Apr. 18,* 1106.
Postmen, Promotion System for, *Apr. 18,* 1105.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
Cabs, Taximeter—Provision as to Fares chargeable, *Apr. 22,* 1413, 1414.
County Councils, Cause for Deductions in Grants to, *Apr. 15,* 619, 622, 623.
Kildare Land Purchase Arrears, Amount chargeable for, *Apr. 22,* 1385.
Land Purchase Stock
Interest, Payment of, *Apr. 22,* 1429.
Investment of Money, *Apr. 22,* 1429.
Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, Applications received under, *Apr. 23,* 1565.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Dingle Harbour Improvements, Necessity for and Proposals as to, *Apr. 18,* 1129.
Education Inspectors, Allegations as to Dissatisfaction among, *Apr. 19,* 1260; *Apr. 22,* 1372.
Irish Provident Assurance Company Inquiry, Result of, *Apr. 22,* 1416.
Local Government Board Analyst, Terms of Office of—Complaints against Sir C. Cameron, *Apr. 22,* 1391.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
Birmingham—Case of Mrs. Gould, *Apr. 17,* 949.
India
Comilla Riots, Information as to, *Apr. 16,* 757, 759.
Punjab Land Alienation Bill, Object of and Agitation against, *Apr. 16,* 759.
Unemployed Workmen Act, Allegations as to Failure, of, *Apr. 17,* 949.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
Strokestown Union Labourers Cottages, Site selected for, *Apr. 17,* 999.

Old Age Pensions
Auxiliary Forces, Commencement with certain Members of, proposed.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 11,* 333.
Government Proposals for dealing with Matter.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1190, 1191, 1211; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1215; Mr. S. Roberts, 1226; Mr. Rees, 1228; Col. R. Williams, 1237; Mr. Maddison, 1244, 1245, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1250, 1251; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22,* 1438. 1439, 1441; Sir C. Dilke, 1461; Mr S. Wortley, 1470; Sir T. P. Whittaker 1477 1478.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
Oughterard Union—Cause of Typhus Fever Outbreak, *Apr. 19,* 1267.

O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
Madden Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. R. Mahony, *Apr. 18,* 1129.
Taxation—Direct and Indirect Percentages (1906–7 and 1907–8), *Apr. 23,* 1547.

Onslow, Earl of
Standing Order 128—Alteration of, to allow Payment of Interest out of Capital by Railways during Construction, *Apr. 16,* 730, 731.

Open Spaces (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 11,* 393.

Opium
Ceylon—Increase of Traffic under British Rule.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 15.* 594, 595.
German Settlements in China and Kiaochow, Restrictions on Sale in.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18,* 1137.
Indian
Bengal Opium available for Export.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 11,* 341.
Exports in 1906, Value of—Amount sent to China.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 10,* 207.
Trade with China, Proposals of Chinese Government with regard to—Tabling Papers, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 11,* 352.
Suppression of Traffic—British Representation at Conference.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 362.

Orange River Colony
Constitution—Cause of Delay in Issue of Letters Patent.
Q. Mr. Mackarness ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 15,* 592.

Orange Street Waterworks
Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *Apr. 8,* 56, 60 ; Mr. Harcourt, 60.

Ormathwaite Estate
Reinstatement Claim of T. Walsh.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22,* 1401.

O'Rourke Estate
Sale Proposals for—Inclusion of Turbary, etc.
Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 999, 1000.

Orpen Estate
Griffin, T., Provision of Farm for.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 1002, 1003.

Osborne
Advisory Committee, Estimate for Travelling Expenses of.
Os. Mr. Morton ; Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8,* 29.

Vote for, *Apr. 8,* 26 ; *Apr. 9,* 190.

Osborne House
Sanitary Condition of.
Os. Mr. Lea, Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8,* 28.

Soldiers, Admission of, to Convalescent Home, proposed.
Os. Mr. Morton, *Apr. 8,* 26 ; Sir F. Banbury, 26 ; Sir W. Evans-Gordon, 27 ; Mr. Lea, 27 ; Mr. Cochrane, 27.

Oughterard Union
Typhus Outbreak, Cause of—Allegations as to Famine in District, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Malley ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19,* 1267.

Owengallis
Cross Roads, Erection of Letter Box on, proposed.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18,* 1109.

Oxford and District Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 17,* 921.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 22,* 1369.

Packenham Estate
Untenanted Land, Proposals for Sale of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10,* 222

Paisley
Magistrates' Order as to Alterations to Licensed House—Identity of Workmen, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lea ; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 15,* 614, 615 ; *Apr. 22,* 1420, 1421.

Palaces, Royal
Vote for, *Apr. 8,* 18 ; *Apr. 9,* 189.

Panama Canal
Trinidad Labourers, Tabling Contract for Recruitment of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nield ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 10,* 199.

Paper
Cotton Stalk Fibre, Use of, for Papermaking—Information in Possession of Colonial Office.
Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 9,* 77.

Parents, Negligent
Power to Prosecute under Existing Acts.
Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 381.

Parker, Mr. J. [Halifax]
Germany—Destitute British Subjects applying at Consulate in Hamburg for Relief, *Apr. 16,* 764.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Abyssinia—Legation House at Adis Abera, Estimate for, *Apr. 8,* 32.

Africa East
- Administration of—Date of establishing Legislative Council and forming White Police Force, *Apr. 11,* 359.
- Judges and Magistrates, Qualifications and Experience of, *Apr. 11,* 358.
- White and Indian Settlements, Proposals for Promoting, *Apr. 11,* 358.

Bills, Referring to Standing Committee—Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of Colonies, or Relations with the Mother Country, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 819–821.

Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, Vote for—Acquisition of Sites and Buildings and Works in Connection therewith, *Apr. 8.* 35.

Egypt—Consulate at Cairo, Increase in Estimate for Erection of, *Apr. 8,* 35.

Emigration Statistics for 1904—Comparison with Germany, *Apr. 18,* 1156.

Germany, Labour Conditions in—Ability of British Workmen to Furnish Reliable Report after Six Weeks, Visit to Germany, *Apr. 22,* 1404.

Honduras Republic—Service required of Domiciled Foreigners during Disturbances, *Apr. 16,* 765.

[*cont.*

Parker, Sir G.—*cont.*
Japan—Tokio, Estimate for House for Assistant Japanese Secretary, *Apr. 8*, 32.
National Physical Laboratory Accounts, Tabling of, *Apr. 15*, 612.
Navy—"Blake and Blenheim," Classification of, *Apr. 11*, 350.
New Hebrides Anglo-French Committee, Information as to, *Apr. 11*, 361.
Standing Committees—Devolution aimed at by Proposals, *Apr. 15*, 674.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1667–1670.
Transvaal Chinese Labour Repatriation, Proposals for Continuing, *Apr. 18*, 1134.

Parkmore
Road to Red Bay, Condition of and Proposals for Improving.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 15*, 585, 586.

Parks and Pleasure Gardens
Vote for, *Apr. 8*, 68; *Apr. 9*, 191, 192.

Parliament
House of Commons
Committees, *see that title.*
Kitchen Committee—Purchase of Vaccinated Veal, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Sir J. A. Jacoby, *Apr. 15*, 613, 614.
Lobbies, Use of Electric Fans proposed.
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 17*, 962.
Newspaper Reading Room, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
House of Lords
Business, Course of.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, *Apr. 17*, 935; Lord Courtney, 936.
Readjustment of Relations with House of Commons, Proposals as to.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
Houses of
Accounts, Separation of, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Ward, *Apr. 8*, 71; Mr. Harcourt, 71.
Furniture for, Estimate for.
Os. Mr. Morton, Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8*, 70.
Vote for, *Apr. 8*, 70; *Apr. 9*, 191.

Parliamentary Elections
New Members Sworn
Clark, G. S., for Belfast (North), *Apr. 23*, 1580.
Holt, R. D., for Northumberland (Hexham), *Apr. 9*, 83.

Parliamentary Elections—*cont.*
New Members Sworn—*cont.*
Nugent, Sir W. R., for Westmeath (South), *Apr. 19*, 1268.
Sheehan, D. D., for Cork County (Mid.), *Apr. 15*, 627.
New Writs Issued.
Belfast (North), *Apr. 9*, 73.

Parliamentary Procedure
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees *see under* Bills.
Blocking Motions and Bills, Proposals for preventing.
Qs. Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. L. Jones, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Bowles; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 377–379.
Business of, to have Precedence—*Motion* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Apr. 11*, 394; *Apr. 15*, 628.
Eleven o'Clock Rule, Suspension of—*Motion* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Apr. 11*, 397.
Members of Parliament, *see that title.*
Reform Proposals
Additional Time for Discussion of, proposed.
Os. Mr. E. Cecil, *Apr. 15*, 685, 686, 697–700; Sir F. Banbury, 700; Sir H. Craik, 701; Mr. W. Rutherford, 703; Mr. Pirie, 704.
Termination of Proceedings—Closure
Motion [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Apr. 15*, 633, 697, 711.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 15*, 631; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 634–638; Mr. Ellis, 639; Mr. A. Smith, 641; Mr. Pirie, 642; Sir J. Jardine, 644; Mr. G. Faber, 644; Sir F. Banbury, 645, 646; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 646–649; Mr. Long, 649–651; Lord R. Cecil, 651; Mr. Dalziel, 655; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 659; Sir E. Cornwall, 659–661; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 661; Mr. Morton, 662–664; Sir H. Fowler, 666.
Scottish Committee, Omission from the Resolution, proposed
Os. Lord R. Cecil, *Apr. 15*, 654; Mr. Smeaton, 654; Mr. Dalziel, 655, 656; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 657.
Standing Orders, *see that title.*

Parliamentary Voters (Registration) Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 11*, 394.

Apr. 8—*Apr.* 23.

Partington, Mr. O. [Derbyshire, High Peak]
- Agricultural Employment in Certain Foreign Countries in 1881, 1891, and 1901, *Apr. 22*, 1397.
- Volunteer Camp at Lulworth—Refusal of Permission to Young Men's Christian Association to Erect Recreation Tent, *Apr. 22*, 1393.

Patents and Designs Bill
- c. 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1012.
- Clause 10, Effect of, on Existing Treaties, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1154, 1155.
- Effect on Existing Acts—Memorandum proposed.
  - *Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15*, 602, 603.
- Instructions to Committee—Speaker's Rulings as to, *Apr. 17*, 1054–1056.
- Special Tribunal for hearing of all Actions and Proceedings relating to—Instruction to Committee.
  - *Os.* Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 17*, 1055, 1056; Mr. Rawlinson, 1055; Mr. Cave, 1056.

Patents and Designs (Consolidation) Bill
- c. 1R.* *Apr. 18*, 1174.

Patents and Designs (No. 2) Bill
- c. 1R.* *Apr. 11*, 394.

Patriotic Fund, Royal
- Premises, Rent of and Vote on which sum is placed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 18.

Paupers
- *See under* Poor Law.

Pearce, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
- London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1516–1518.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
- Army, Second Line—Cost of Providing Uniforms, *Apr. 8*, 12.
- Canadian Intermediate Tariff with certain Foreign Countries, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1140.
- Cape Colony—Cost of Simon's Bay Dockyard Extension, *Apr. 15*, 573.
- China—Proposals for Restricting Poppy Cultivation Area, *Apr. 16*, 766.
- Colonial Conference, 1907, Ministers Present at, *Apr. 11*, 347.
- Congo Free State
  - British Coloured Subjects, Allegations as to Ill-treatment of, *Apr. 8*, 15.
  - Firearms, Importation of—Proposals for Discussion, *Apr. 8*, 15.

Pease, Mr. H. P.—*cont.*
- Education
  - Amount raised by Rates in Ireland, *Apr. 16*, 778.
  - Proposals for Revising Irish Elementary System, *Apr. 16*, 751.
  - Welsh Department Offices, Control of Permanent Secretary over, *Apr. 9*, 78.
- Imported Goods from certain Colonies in 1906, Duty on, *Apr. 22*, 1418.
- India—Bombay Textile Factories, Date of Issue of Report on, *Apr. 22*, 1399.
- Jamaica
  - Loan and Grant, Decision as to, *Apr. 15*, 594.
  - Proposals for Tabling Papers as to Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 11*, 335.
- Local Authorities' Debt, Interest Payable, etc., *Apr. 18*, 1123.
- Napsbury Asylum—Cost per Bed, *Apr. 16*, 749.
- Navy
  - Gunnery Prizes, Expenditure on, *Apr. 15*, 573.
  - Torpedo Ranges, Reason for Reduction in Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 12.
- New Hebrides
  - Information as to Anglo-French Committee, *Apr. 11*, 360, 361.
  - Native Labour, Conditions of Employing, *Apr. 18*, 1139.
- Opium—Indian Exports in 1906, Value of, and Amount sent to China, *Apr. 10*, 207.
- Parents, Negligent, Power to Prosecute under Existing Acts, *Apr. 11*, 381.
- Poor Law—Balances in Hands of Guardians in England and Wales, *Apr. 10*, 200, 201.
- Soudan—Congolese Occupation of Bahr-el-Ghazal, *Apr. 11*, 213.
- Volunteers
  - Buildings, Drill-halls, etc., Value of, *Apr. 15*, 578, 589.
  - Financial Liability, Consent to Transfer of, *Apr. 15*, 578.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharges, Reason for and Proposals for Obviating, *Apr. 11*, 351.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
- Adjournment of the House, Motion for, *Apr. 8*, 72.
- Eleven o'Clock Rule, Suspension of, *Apr. 10*, 328.

Penal Servitude Acts
- Conditional Licence Granted, *Apr. 19*, 1258; *Apr. 22*, 1343.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
  Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills Affecting Government and Administration of India proposed, *Apr. 16*, 831.

Persia
  Belgian Directors of Customs, Dismissal of, alleged.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 595.
  British Consuls, Instructions to, as to British Commercial Enterprises.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 18*, 1137, 1138.
  British Legation at Teheran, Indian Contribution to Upkeep of.
    Os. Mr. Rees, *Apr. 8*, 33, 37.
  Yezd—Imposition of Tufangchari Tax.
    Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 766.

Philipps, Lieut.-Colonel I. [Southampton]
  Southampton Telephone Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1394.

Philipps, Mr. O. C. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
  Guiana, British, and West Indies, Profit on Silver Currency shipped to, *Apr 8*, 10.

Phthisis
  Compulsory Notification, Necessity for..
    Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15*, 604, 605.

"Physical Energy" Statue
  Progress made with Casting and Erection of.
    Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 6*, 53, 55; Mr. Harcourt, 54.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
  Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1020.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
  Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 11*, 392.
  Moray Firth, Foreign Vessels Trawling in, *Apr. 15*, 615.
  Parliamentary Reform Proposals
    Additional Time for Discussion of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 704.
    Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 642.
  Scottish Committees, Proposals as to—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *Apr. 15*, 642, 643.

Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill
  c. 3R.* *Apr. 9*, 73.
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 561.

Police
  Expenditure on and Rate per Head of Population.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 15*, 572.
  Local Authorities, keeping of Mounted Police by.
    Q. Mr. Seddon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 17*, 961.
  Metropolitan
    House of Commons Duty—Vote to which Cost is chargeable.
      Q. Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 9*, 81.
    Library Fund, Subscription to.
      Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 9*, 79.
    Weekly Day of Rest, Increase of Force required in Order to give.
      Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 9*, 78.
  Scotland
    Annual Report Presented, *Apr. 8*, 4; *Apr. 15*, 564.
    Services, Grants for (1906) and Cost per Head of Population.
      Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 12*, 479, 498.
    Statistics for
      Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 16*, 747.

Police Superannuation Bill
  Special Facilities for, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 10*, 202.

Poor Law
  Balances in Hands of Guardians in England and Wales.
    Qs. Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 10*, 200, 201.
  Children
    Boarding-out Statistics.
      Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15*, 583.
      Q. Sir G. S. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 16*, 747, 748.
    Emigration to Canada in 1906.
      Q. Mr. W. Hope; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15*, 583.
    Milk Supply in Workhouses, Regulations for ensuring Purity of.
      Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 17*, 948.
  Irish Reform Proposals
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 10*, 226.
  Paupers relieved on 1st January and 1st July, 1907—Statement Presented, *Apr. 15*, 570.

[*cont.*

Poor Prisoners Defence Act
Amendment of Rules, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Rendall; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18*, 1148.
Applications received under and Number of Refusals.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 23.* 1565.

Poor Rate
See under Rates and Rating.

Poplar
Poor Relief Statistics (1904–7).
Q. Mr. C. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 22*, 1395, 1396.

Population, Revenue and Expenditure
Progress of—Issue of Memorandum proposed.
Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1163, 1164.

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 10*, 193.
*Rep.** *Apr. 18*, 1102.

Port William
Church Property, Allocation of.
Qs. Mr. Gulland; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1423.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*Under-Secretary of State for War.*
Army (Annual) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 16*, 732; *Com.*, *Apr. 17*, 935.

Portugal
Trade Report, Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
See also names of places.
Early Closing Days, Arrangements for Letter Deliveries on.
Q. Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 22*, 1377.

Ireland
Assaults on Officials—Measures for Police Protection, etc.
Q. Mr. A. Smith; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1399.
Revenue and Expenditure (1895, 1700 and 1905).
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 624.
Stores in—Proposals for Appointment of Controller.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1168.
Lodgers' Letters, Regulations as to Re-addressing.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 772.

Post Office—*cont.*
Mail Service.
Indian Mail, Arrangements for.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1158, 1159.
New Zealand Route *via* San Francisco, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 773.
West Indies—Subsidies and Postage Received.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1109.
Parcel Post—Foreign and Colonial Amendment Regulations, Presented, *Apr. 9*, 75; *Apr. 15*, 567.
Postage on Periodicals Sent to Canada, Proposals for Reduction of.
Qs. Sir W. Holland, Mr. A. Chamberlain; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 607, 608.
Postal Orders
Colonies in Which Orders are Payable.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 745.
Foreign and Colonial Amendment Regulations, Presented, *Apr. 9*, 75; *Apr. 15*, 567.
Transfer of Irish Business to Ireland, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 579.
Postmen, Promotion System for.
Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1105.
Promotions and Transfers to English and Irish Postmastership in 1906.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 579.
Revenue, Causes of Decrease in, during 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1179.
Rifle Ranges on Roofs of Post Office Buildings, Circumstances of Erection of.
Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 10*, 215.
Scotland—Cost of Services in Certain Years.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 22*, 1415.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 23*, 1568.
Stamps, Causes of Decreased Revenue from.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1179.
Tramway Undertakings Conveying Mails and Employees, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 772, 773.

Post Office Savings Banks
Deposits and Withdrawals, Comparison of.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 11*, 338.
Irish Business, Transfer of, to Ireland, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 580.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees.
  - Division of Bills into Two Parts, One for Consideration by the House, the Other to go to Standing Committee, Proposals as to, *Apr. 16*, 865.
  - Withdrawal of Bills From Discussion by the House, Objections to, *Apr. 11*, 468.
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., 525, 527.
  - Referring to Standing Committee on Trades, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 552, 555.
- Education Code, Date of Tabling, *Apr. 17*, 981.
- Standing Committees, Chairman, Method of Selection, *Apr. 15*, 677.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
- Waterford—Route for Postal Despatch to London, *Apr. 23*, 1553.

Prerogative of Mercy
- Principles Governing Exercise of.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 11*, 366.

Prescot
- Land Tax Commissioners, Procedure in Appointing.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Taylor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 18*, 1162, 1163.

President of the Board of Agriculture
- *Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.*

President of the Board of Education
- *Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.*

President of the Board of Trade
- *Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.*

President of the Local Government Board
- *Rt. Hon. J. Burns.*

Prevention of Corruption Act
- Foreign Firms, Secret Commissions offered by—Liability of Agents to Penalty, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. M. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1154.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
- Buckingham Palace Stone Work, Removal of Paint from, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 20.
- Edinburgh
  - Law Courts, Improvement of. *Apr. 8*, 56, 57.
  - Post Office Extension, Urgency of the Matter, *Apr. 8*, 45.
- Income Tax Collection in Scotland—Date of issuing Notices, *Apr. 18*, 1236.
- Redditch Railway Signalman J. Canning, Hours of Labour of, *Apr. 15*, 600.
- Tea Duty, Continuance of, at 5d. in the £, *Apr. 18*, 1236.

Prisons
- Warders, Grievances of—Proposals for dealing with Matter.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 11*, 365.

Public Rights of Way Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading Read and Bill Withdrawn, *Apr. 9*, 83.

Public Rights of Way (No. 2) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 15*, 627.

Quarries
- Managers, System of Appointing.
  - *Q.* Sir A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 23*, 1564.
- Reports of Inspectors (1906), Presented, *Apr. 19*, 1258; *Apr. 22*, 1343.

Questions
- Answers to Oral Questions, Expediting Printing of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 382, 383.
- Hypothetical, Out of Order, *Apr. 15*, 600.
- Implication in
  - *Os.* Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 16*, 775, 776.
- Irrelevant, *Apr. 10*, 226; *Apr. 17*, 1006, 1007.
- Matter of Opinion, Question on, not in Order, *Apr. 10*, 218.
- Notice to be given of, *Apr. 11*, 357; *Apr 15*. 612; *Apr. 17*, 991, 992; *Apr. 22* 1435.
- Quotations from Newspapers in
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 10*, 225.
- Refusal to Answer, Powers of Minister as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 23*, 1577.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
- Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17* 1053, 1054.

Railways
- Accidents
  - Fatal Accidents to Employees, Number of and Inquiries into.
    - *Q.* Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 10*, 203, 204.
  - Reports on, containing Statements as to long Hours worked by Officials—Return Ordered, *Apr. 8*, 6.
  - Returns (1906), Presented, *Apr. 15*, 564.
- Great Southern and Western (Ireland)—Languages included in Clerks' Examinations.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15*, 581.

[*cont.*

Railways—*cont.*
  Light Railways, Street and Road, Information as to—Return Ordered, *Apr. 17,* 939.
  London, Brighton and South Coast Trains, Complaints as to Lighting of.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15,* 601.
  Payment of Interest out of Capital during Construction—Alteration of Standing Orders No. 128, proposed.
    Os. Earl of Onslow, *Apr. 16,* 730, 731.
  Subscriptions to London Municipal Society, *see* London Municipal Society.

Randles, Sir J. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
  Africa, East—Promotion of Settlement, *Apr. 11,* 359.

Rates and Rating
  Ireland
    Necessity for Revision of System in Urban Districts.
      Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr Birrell, *Apr. 18,* 1108.
    Poor Rate, System of Collecting—Rule as to Disfranchisement for non-Payment.
      Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22,* 1388, 1389.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
  Bills referred to Standing Committees, Powers of the Crown, or either House of Parliament, Bills modifying or taking away to be Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11,* 465–466.
  Financial Credit of the Country, Position of, and Proposals for Reinstating, *Apr. 18,* 1249.
  Income Tax
    Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be Taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 18,* 1246.
    Permanency of, *Apr. 18,* 1247, 1248.
  London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15,* 691.
  Patents and Designs Bill—Special Tribunal for hearing of all Actions and Proceedings relating to—Instruction to Committee, *Apr. 17,* 1055.
  Tea Duty, Continuance of, at 5d. in the £, *Apr. 18,* 1249.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill
  c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *Apr. 11,* 329.
  Con. Apr. 22,* 1269.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
  Coal Miners (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12,* 545, 546.

Records, Public
  Annual Report Presented, *Apr. 11,* 331, *Apr. 15,* 565.

Redditch
  Railway Signalman J. Canning, Hours of Labour of.
    Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 15,* 600.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
  King's County, Agrarian Outrages in and Condition of, *Apr. 17,* 991, 992.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
  Agriculture Department
    Travelling Veterinary Surgeon, Proposals for creating Post of, *Apr. 17,* 1000.
    Working of—Date of Presenting Report, *Apr. 15,* 618.
  Athenry Unlawful Assembly Case on 4th April, *Apr. 17,* 989, 990.
  County Councils, Cause for Reduction in Grants to, *Apr. 15,* 621–623; *Apr. 22,* 1379, 1425, 1427, 1431.
  Land Purchase Stock
    Interest, Payment of, *Apr. 22,* 1427.
    Investment of Money raised by, *Apr. 22,* 1431.
  Poor Rate, System of Collecting, *Apr. 22,* 1388.
  Questions
    Censuring Conduct of Judge, Permissibility of, *Apr. 16,* 755, 776.
    Quotations from Newspapers in, *Apr 10,* 225; *Apr. 23,* 1570.
  Works Board Staff, Religious Opinions of *Apr. 15,* 624.
  Yorkshire, Crime in, *Apr. 16,* 770.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
  Dublin Royal Botanic Gardens—Wages of Staff, *Apr. 22,* 1387.
  Standing Committees—Effect of New Rules on existing Standing Committees, *Apr. 15,* 728; *Apr. 16,* 779.
  Westropp Estate Untenanted Land, Disposal of, *Apr. 22,* 1387.
  Yorkshire, Crime in, *Apr. 16,* 770.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
  Abyssinia—Legation House at Adis Abeba, Estimate for, *Apr. 8,* 32.
  Africa, Central, Native Labour Recruitment in, *Apr. 21,* 211, 212.
  China
    Assault on Representative of Messrs. Jardine and Matheson at Wuchan, *Apr. 22,* 1411.
    Customs Service—European Officials replaced by Chinese, *Apr. 22,* 1410.

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
- Clementi, Mr. Tour of—Record available, *Apr. 19*, 1263.
- Hours of Labour (Bakehouses) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1100.
- Imperial Institute—Indian Section, decision as to future Position of, *Apr. 8*, 12.
- Income Tax on Earned Incomes—Pensions, Annuities, etc., Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1227, 1228.
- India
  - Bimlipatam, Decision as to Railway Extension to, *Apr. 8*, 13, 14.
  - Bombay—*Vihari* Newspaper—Sentence on Editor for publication of Seditious Matter, *Apr. 10*, 206.
  - Budget, Facilities for discussing, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
  - Jamrud, Tribal Fighting near, *Apr. 17*, 954.
  - Mayo College, Imperial Assistance to, *Apr. 15*, 591.
  - Snakes, Discontinuance of Reward for killing, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 584.
  - Trade Journal, Information given in, *Apr. 8*, 13.
- Navy
  - Battleships, Statistics as to Number laid down and Number struck off List, *Apr. 10*, 196.
  - Special Service Vessels, Information as to, *Apr. 15*, 574.
- Nigeria, Northern, Railway Construction in, *Apr. 17*, 975.
- Old Age Pensions—Government Proposals for dealing with the matter, *Apr. 18*, 1228.
- Paper made from Cotton Stalk Fibre, Information in possession of Colonial Office, *Apr. 9*, 77.
- Persia
  - Belgian Director of Customs, Dismissal of, alleged, *Apr. 15*, 595.
  - British Consuls, Commercial Duties of, *Apr. 18*, 1137.
  - British Legation at Teheran, Indian Contribution to Upkeep of, *Apr. 8*, 33, 37.
- Russia—British Embassy at St. Petersburg, Acquisition of, *Apr. 8*, 36.
- Tea Duty, Continuance of, at 5d. in the Pound, *Apr. 18*, 1226, 1227.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R. *Apr. 10*, 291–294; *Apr. 23*, 1584–1593.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour Morality—Proposals as to further Reports, *Apr. 15*, 572.
- Uganda Railway—Cost of Construction, *Apr. 9*, 77.
- Vaccination—Remuneration of Public Vaccinators, *Apr. 17*, 950.
- Welsh Church Commission—Resignation of certain Members, *Apr. 18*, 1169.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
- Report Presented, *Apr. 10*, 194; *Apr. 15*, 565.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
  - Colonies, Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of, or Relations with the Mother Country, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 821.
  - King's Speech, Exemption of Bills referred to in, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 855.
- Fruit Pulp, Sugar Duties on, *Apr. 11*, 332.
- Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks—Comparison of Deposits and Withdrawals. *Apr. 11*, 338.
- Shettleston Free Church Property, Allocation of, *Apr. 18*, 1122.

Rendall, Mr. A. [Gloucestershire, Thornbury]
- Poor Prisoners' Defence Act—Proposals for Amendment of Rules, *Apr. 18*, 1148.

Renton, Major L. [Lincolnshire Gainsborough]
- Army Officers—Appointments and Promotions from the Ranks (1898–1903), *Apr. 15*, 587.

Réunion
- Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 17*, 923.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Accounts (1906–7), Presented, *Apr. 22*, 1371.
- Capital Expenditure, Amount provided for during 1906–7.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
- Capital Liabilities, Position of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1183, 1184, 1185.
- Civil Government, Cost of.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 10.
- Collection and Expenditure—Return Ordered, *Apr. 16*, 736.
- Estimate for 1907–8.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1181, 1182.
- Exchequer Balance Sheet, 1906–7.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1180.
- Financial Credit of the Country, Position of, and Proposals for Reinstating.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1186–1188; Mr. Rawlinson, 1249.
- Financial Statement, Form of.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 596, 597.
- Reductions effected in Expenditure.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1181.
- Surplus of Revenue from 1906–7.
  - *Os.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1176.

Revolvers
- Sale of, Proposals for Restricting.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. H. Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 11,* 214.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill
- c. *Con.** *Apr. 15,* 569.
- 3R.* *Apr. 18* 1102.
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 22,* 1341.

Rifle Ranges
- Post Office Buildings, Circumstances of Erection on Roofs of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Cremer; *A* Mr. Buxton. *Apr. 10,* 215.

Rights of Way (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill
- c. 1R.† *Apr. 18,* 1174.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal*
- Business, Course of, *Apr. 17,* 935.

Robeck, Baron de
- Sale Proposals for Estate of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 997.

Roberts, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
- Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 23,* 1649.
- Liquor Licence Duties, Necessity for Revision of, *Apr. 18,* 1231–1233.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
- Local Authorities, Powers as to Purchase and Holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10,* 310–314.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
  - Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16,* 794.
  - Clauses relating to Money Grants, etc., to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11,* 429.
- Income Tax on Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 18,* 1226.
- National Debt—New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 18,* 1226.
- Old-age Pensions—Government Proposals for dealing with the Matter, *Apr. 18,* 1226.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
- Admiralty
  - Administrative Policy, Criticisms on, Charges of Secrecy, etc., *Apr. 17,* 1085.
  - Contracts—Allocation of Irish Firms, *Apr. 23,* 1546.
  - Fisher, Sir J., Retired Pay to be granted to, *Apr. 11,* 349.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
- Admiralty—*cont.*
  - Officials in Supply and Accounting Departments, Leave, etc., of, *Apr. 17,* 955.
  - Sea Lords, Emoluments of, *Apr. 11,* 349.
- "Agamemnon," and "Lord Nelson," Reserve Guns for, *Apr. 10,* 209.
- Battleships, Statistics as to Number laid down and Number struck off List, *Apr. 10,* 196.
- "Blake and Blenheim," Classification of, *Apr. 11,* 350.
- Cadets, Cost of Educating, *Apr. 23,* 1559.
- Cape Colony—Cost of Simon's Bay Dockyard Extension, *Apr. 15,* 573.
- Casualties Return, Information given in *Apr. 16,* 747.
- China Campaign of 1900—Awards to Engineer Officers of "Algerine," "Fame," and "Whiting," *Apr. 23,* 1553.
- Classification of Ships—Reconsideration of present System proposed, *Apr. 11,* 350.
- Coastguard Reduction, Proposals for, *Apr. 22,* 1402.
  - Stations closed during past Twelve Months, *Apr. 17,* 971.
- Dockyards, Stoppages for Time Lost, Regulations as to, *Apr. 23,* 1546.
- Domestics, Inquiry and Decision as to, *Apr. 15,* 582.
- "Dreadnought," Cost of—Reason for Exclusion of Cost of Reserve of Guns, *Apr. 10,* 209.
- Electric Light, Distribution of Reduction in Sum provided for, *Apr. 8,* 12.
- Estimates—Alteration in Form of Vote for Nucleus Crews, *Apr. 17,* 972, 973.
- Foreign Countries, Shipbuilding Programmes of, *Apr. 17,* 973.
- Gibraltar Dockyard Extension Scheme, Buildings omitted from, *Apr. 11,* 348.
- Greenwich Observatory—Effect of London County Council Generating Station, *Apr. 11,* 348.
- Gunnery Prizes, Expenditure on, *Apr. 15,* 573.
- "Invincible," Cost of, *Apr. 10,* 208.
- Manning Statistics, *Apr. 17,* 972.
- Metal on Ships, Means of calculating Weight of. *Apr. 22,*1382.
- Obsolete Vessels, Sum realised by Sale of—Weight and Value of Metal, *Apr. 16,* 754, 755.
- Officers with Brevet Rank serving in Seagoing Ships, *Apr. 22,* 1402; *Apr. 23,* 1548, 1559.
- Plumbers, Pay of, *Apr. 16,* 739.

[*cont.*

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
Portsmouth Dockyard
Chargemen, Pay of, *Apr. 23,* 1553.
Ship Fitters' Assistants, Present Employment of, *Apr. 23,* 1547.
Preparedness for War, *Apr. 17,* 1091.
Ratings Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Apr. 15,* 582.
Repairs, Provision for, *Apr. 17,* 1091.
Rosyth Works, Progress made with, *Apr. 15,* 586.
Shipbuilding
Cost of Battleships and Cruisers to be completed by 1909, *Apr. 10,* 208.
Date of completing certain Vessels, *Apr. 16,* 755.
German Programme, Alleged Misstatement as to, *Apr. 17,* 1088.
Programme, Information as to, *Apr, 16,* 756.
Tonnage of New Battleships, *Apr. 17,* 974.
Shore Appointments held by Executive and Engineer Officers, *Apr. 11,* 350.
Special Service Vessels, Information as to, *Apr. 15,* 574.
Stokehold Boots, Result of Experiment as to, *Apr. 15,* 583.
Torpedo Ranges, Reason for Reduction in Estimate for, *Apr. 8,* 12.
"Truth about the Navy," Circulation of, to Crews at the Public Expense, *Apr, 17,* 1090.
Two-power Standard, Proposals as to maintaining, *Apr. 17,* 1076, 1091.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
Egypt
British Consular Service—Standard of Proficiency in the Native Language, *Apr. 11,* 364.
Concessions Board, Constitution of, *Apr. 11,* 362.
Landholders—Penalties for Infraction of Rules, *Apr. 11,* 363.
Newspapers—Subsidies granted to *Al Mokattam al Wartan* and *Les Progres, Apr. 11,* 363.
Secret Service, Sums granted for, during past Five Years, *Apr. 11,* 362.
Hexham Parliamentary Election, Reason for Postponement of, *Apr. 11,* 384.
Soudan
Khartoum Natives, Application of, for Establishment of Girls' Schools, *Apr. 16,* 763.
Land acquired by Government, Prices paid, etc., *Apr. 16,* 763.

Robertson, Sir G. S. [Bradford, Central]
Poor Law Children—Boarding-out Statistics, *Apr. 16,* 747.

Robson Sir W. S.—*Solicitor-General* [South Shields]
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17,* 1051, 1052.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Athenry Unlawful Assembly Case on 4th April, *Apr. 17,* 990; *Apr. 22,* 1390.

Roscommon
Quarter Sessions—Decision of Judge in Action against Police for value of Drum.
Qs. Captain Faber, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16,* 775, 776.

Rosyth Naval Base
See under Navy.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]
Erith, Unemployed Relief Works Scheme, Decision as to Grant for, *Apr. 11,* 370.
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22,* 1506.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges
Inquiry and Discussion, Proposals for, *Apr. 15,* 589.
Number Employed (1884-1906), *Apr. 17,* 967.

Royal Bank of Scotland Bill
l. Rep. Apr. 23,* 1533.

Royal Insurance Company Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 8,* 2.
Rep. Apr. 18,* 1102.
3R.* *Apr. 22,* 1369.

Royston
Milne, Mr. O. B., Case of—Reason for Refusal to Appoint, by West Riding Authority.
Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 10,* 216, 217.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 11,* 371, 372.
Qs. Viscount Turnour, Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 15,* 611, 612.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 17,* 982.
Qs. Mr. Lane Fox, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. G. Faber; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 18,* 1159–1161.
Regulations for testing Efficiency of Teachers.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 23,* 1568, 1569.
Reports on Educational Fitness of Mr. Milne, Presented, *Apr. 18,* 1343, 1371.

Rule Committee Bill
- *l.* 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1538.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Dewsbury]
- Administration of Ireland, Accounts subject to partial Local Audit, *Apr. 16*, 741.
- Agriculture Board
  - Office Accommodation, Proposals for improving, *Apr. 23*, 1570.
  - Staff, Salaries of, *Apr. 19*, 1259.
- British Museum Reading Room—Lighting of Storage Rooms by Electricity, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 613.
- Channel Tunnel—French Attitude towards Scheme, Effect of Abandonment on *entente*, etc., *Apr. 8*, 15.
- Chantrey Trust—Powers of National Gallery Trustees, *Apr. 17*, 983.
- China
  - Assault on Representative of Messrs. Jardine and Matheson at Wuchan, *Apr. 22*, 1411.
  - Customs Service—European Officials replaced by Chinese, *Apr. 22*, 1410.
- Chocolate, Duty on and Statistics as to Importation, *Apr. 15*, 596.
- Civil Contingencies Fund—Repayment, Date of Presenting Estimate, *Apr. 9*, 78.
- Civil Service
  - Assistant Clerks
    - Promotion of, *Apr. 16*, 740, 742.
    - Salaries of Clerks in Dublin Offices, *Apr. 8*, 11.
  - Irish Promotion System, *Apr. 23*, 1577
  - Women Typists, Pay of, *Apr. 22*, 1419
- Comptroller and Auditor-General—Retirements during last Thirty Years, *Apr 16*, 740.
- Congo Free State
  - British Coloured Subjects, Allegations as to Ill-treatment of, *Apr. 8*, 15.
  - Firearms, Importation of—Proposals for Discussion, *Apr. 8*, 15.
- County Councils, Cause for Deductions in Grants to, *Apr. 15*, 622, 623; *Apr. 22*, 1380, 1425, 1428.
- County Court Deputy Judges, Payments to during last Five Years, *Apr. 23*, 1549.
- Customs and Excise
  - Senior Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Apr. 11*, 336.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Customs and Excise—*cont.*
  - Statistical Office
    - Clerks employed on Parliamentary Returns, *Apr. 19*, 1258.
    - Extra Duty performed in 1906, *Apr. 11*, 336.
    - New Class Clerks, Petition from, *Apr. 11*, 336.
  - Watchers, Pay of, *Apr. 15*, 574.
- Death Duty claimed when not Exigible, Reimbursement of Expense incurred in resisting, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 597.
- Dublin Registry of Deeds Office—Reply to Memorial for increase of Salaries, *Apr. 10*, 231.
- Exchequer and Audit Department
  - Annual Leave Regulations, *Apr. 18*, 1119.
  - Book-Keeping as Examination Subject, *Apr. 18*, 1119.
  - Colonial Audit Branch
    - Clerks Admitted to (1889–1906), *Apr. 18*, 1118.
    - Formation, Circumstances of and System of appointing Auditors, *Apr. 23*, 1550, 1551.
  - Regulation prohibiting communication of Information to Press, etc., *Apr. 11*, 332.
- Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland
  - Amount raised by Taxation in certain Years, *Apr. 8*, 9.
  - Increase in Cost of Irish Services, Cause of, *Apr. 6*, 10.
  - Sums Voted for Certain Services, *Apr. 15*, 571.
- Government Departments
  - Luncheon Rooms, Cost of Upkeep of, *Apr. 23*, 1550.
  - Saturday Half-Holiday Arrangements, *Apr. 16*, 741.
- Guiana, British—Silver Currency shipped to, Profit on, *Apr. 8*, 11.
- Hague Conference, British Representatives at, *Apr. 22*, 1412.
- Inland Revenue Supervision—Examination since 1897, *Apr. 18*, 1163.
- Kildare Land Purchase Arrears, Amount chargeable for, *Apr. 22*, 1386.
- Land Purchase
  - Guarantee Fund, Position of, *Apr. 22*, 1374; *Apr. 23*, 1552.
  - Stock
    - Interest, Payment of, *Apr. 22*, 1428, 1429.
    - Investment of Money raised by, *Apr. 22*, 1429–1431.

[*cont.*

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Liquor Licences, Renewal of, Reason for Delay in dealing with Appeals, *Apr. 23*, 1571.
- National Physical Laboratory Accounts, Tabling of, *Apr. 15*, 613.
- New Hebrides—Anglo-French Committee, Date of Meeting, *Apr. 22*, 1411.
- Patriotic Fund, Royal, Rent of Premises, and Vote on which Sum is placed, *Apr. 8*, 18.
- Persia, Dismissal of Belgian Directors of Customs, alleged, *Apr. 15*, 595.
- Population, Revenue and Expenditure, Progress of—Issue of Memorandum, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1164.
- Prescot Land Tax Commissioners, Procedure in Appointing, *Apr. 18*, 1163.
- Revenue and Expenditure
  - Civil Government, Cost of, *Apr. 8*, 10.
  - Financial Statement, Form of, *Apr. 15*, 597.
- Schools, New, Provision of Money for—Date of exclusion from Vote on Account, *Apr. 18*, 1162.
- Soudan—Congolese occupation of Bahr-el-Ghazal, *Apr. 11*, 213.
- Taxation
  - Ireland, Revenue collected in (1890, 1895, 1900 and 1905), *Apr. 16*, 743; *Apr. 19*, 1263.
  - Rateable Valuation and collection of Income-Tax per head in Scotland, *Apr. 17*, 942.
- Turkish Customs Increase, Assent of Great Britain to, *Apr. 15*, 595.
- United States—British Representation at opening of Carnegie Institute at Pittsburg, *Apr. 22*, 1412.
- West Indies—Silver Currency shipped to, Profit on, *Apr. 8*, 11.
- Whitehall New Government Offices, Departments to be accommodated in, *Apr. 23*, 1570.
- Works Board, Ireland
  - Character of—Statement by Dublin Chief Magistrate, *Apr. 18*, 1167.
  - Clerks, Promotion System for, *Apr. 22*, 1425.
  - Correspondence with Mr. Williams as to Religious Opinions of Clerks, *Apr. 10*, 231; *Apr. 15*, 623, 624; *Apr. 16*, 779.

Rural Districts
- Medical Officers of Health and Sanitary Inspectors—Return Ordered, *Apr. 18*, 1105.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
- Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 19*, 1299–1304.
- Land Purchase Stock—Investment of Money, *Apr. 22*, 1430.

Russia
- British Embassy at St. Petersburg, Acquisition of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Rees, *Apr. 8*, 36; Mr. Harcourt, 38.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
- Egypt
  - Cattle Importation — Precautions against Diseased Cattle, *Apr. 11*, 364.
  - Milk Supply, etc., Regulations for preventing Adulteration, *Apr. 11*, 364.
  - Pharmacy Laws, Amendment of, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1140.
  - Sugar, Refined, Royalty on, *Apr. 18*, 1140.
- India
  - Army Medical Service, Information as to, *Apr. 22*, 1384.
  - Budget, Facilities for Discussing, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
  - Plague, Precautions against—Deaths since 1896 and Number of Medical Men on Special Duty, *Apr. 22*, 1383, 1384.
- Nottingham University College—Constitution of Court of Governors, *Apr. 15*, 584.
- Opium in Ceylon—Increase of Traffic under British Rule, *Apr. 15*, 594.
- Vaccination Exemption Case of Mr. R. Hayles, *Apr. 18*, 1123.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]
- Admiralty—Residences for First Lord and Senior Naval Lord, *Apr. 8*, 60.
- Bills, referring to Standing Committees
  - Aid Grant or Charge upon the Public Revenue, Exemption of all Bills involving, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 403–408.
  - Clauses relating to Money Grants, etc., to be exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 432.
  - Report Stage of Bills so committed, allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed *Apr. 16*, 850–852.
  - Withdrawal of Bills from Discussion by the House, Objections to, *Apr. 11*, 404, 407.
- Committees, Standing
  - Closure, Proposals as to granting Powers to, *Apr. 15*, 703.
  - Constitution and Methods of Nominating, *Apr. 11*, 405.
- Government Departments, Passenger Lifts at, Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 60, 61.
- Land Registry, Grant to, *Apr. 8*, 61.

[*cont.*

Rutherford, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
Law Courts—Boilers, Estimates for Renewal of, *Apr. 8*, 61.
Meteorological Office, Estimate for, *Apr. 8*, 61.
Parliamentary Reform Proposals, Additional Time for Discussion of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 703.

St. James' Palace
Fire Alarm Installation at, Particulars of.
Qs. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 22, 23; Mr. Harcourt, 23.
Residential Apartments—Case of Mr. Kingscote.
Qs. Mr. Lea, *Apr.* 19, 21, 25; Mr. Morton, 20; Mr. Harcourt, 21, 25.

St. Pancras
Unemployed Statistics (1906–7).
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 10*, 214.

Salisbury Memorial
Vote for, *Apr. 8*, 72; *Apr. 9*, 191.

Salter, Mr. C. [Hampshire, Basingtoke]
Army Order of 11th March, Effect of, *Apr. 11*, 345.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Buxton Garden Company, Case of, *Apr. 15*, 598.

Sandford Wills Estate
Untenanted Land, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17*, 983, 984.

Santo Domingo
See Dominican Republic.

Savings Banks
See Post Office Savings Bank, *and titles* Army and Navy.

Schwann, Sir C. E. [Manchester, N.]
Indian Elementary Education, Proposals for Improving, *Apr. 17*, 954.

Scotland
Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
(*For* particular Place ssee *their Names.*)
Areas, Population, and Valuation of Counties, Burghs, and Parishes—Return Presented, *Apr. 8*, 4; *Apr. 15* 564.
Churches Commission, Function of, as to Allocation of Property.
Q. Sir A. Bignold; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 12*, 498.

Scotland—*cont.*
Court of Session
Act of Sederunt Presented, *Apr. 15*, 568.
Extractor's Department, Application of Session Clerks Act to.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Apr. 17*, 953.
Crofting Counties, Population in—Return Presented, *Apr. 17*, 923.
Deer Forests, Proposals for Restricting Extension of.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1421.
Education, *see that title.*
Lights on Vehicles, By-laws as to—Return Presented, *Apr. 9*, 75.
Meat Inspection Inquiry by Dr. Dittmar, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 15*, 614.
Population in 1841 and 1906.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 16*, 737, 738.
Rights of Way, Public—Proposals as to Remedial Legislation.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 22*, 1421, 1422.
Royal Scottish Museum—Heating, Ventilating and Safeguarding against Fire.
Qs. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 9*, 81, 82.
Unemployed Distress Committees, Proceedings of—Report Presented, *Apr. 8*, 5; *Apr. 15*, 564.
Whaling Stations in.
Q. Mr. Starkey; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 16*, 773.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
Sugar Duty, Proposals as to, *Apr. 18*, 1239, 1240.

Scott Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
Committee, Grand—Proposals as to Sittings, *Apr. 22*, 1401.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Customs Statistical Department—Extra Duty performed in 1906, *Apr. 11*, 336.
London Chamber of Commerce Ballot for Colonial Preference—Number Voting, etc., *Apr. 15*, 625.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. W. [Lancashire, Newton]
Customs Act, 1842, Enforcement of—Case of Goldsmith Company *v.* Wyatt, *Apr. 17,* 954.
Police, Mounted, Keeping of, by Local Authorities, *Apr. 17,* 961.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
Aliens Act, Repeal of, proposed, *Apr. 18,* 1147.
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of Colonies, or Naval and Military Questions, *Apr. 16,* 822.
New Hebrides—Information as to Anglo-French Committee, *Apr. 18,* 1139.
Soldiers—Reason for omitting Map-reading from Examination, *Apr. 12,* 501.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9,* 139–147; *Apr. 23,* 1588, 1589.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
Nigeria, Northern, Railway Construction in, *Apr. 17,* 974.

Shanklin Gas Bill
c. Rep. Apr. 18,* 1102.

Shardlow Union
Death Certificates, Fee charged for.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 16,* 771.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs.]
Court of Session Extractor's Department, Application of Session Clerks Act to, *Apr. 17,* 953.
Lunatic Asylums, District, Discharge of Dangerous Patients from and Class of Persons admitted to, *Apr. 22,* 1424.
Marriage Laws, Revision of, proposed, *Apr. 17,* 953.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]
Barry, Mr. J., Estate of—Reinstatement Claims of Evicted Tenants, *Apr. 17,* 1003.
Colthurst Estate—Reinstatement Claim of J. Murphy, *Apr. 18,* 1113.
Gascoigne Estate—Purchase by Kilfinane Tenants, *Apr. 18,* 1112.
Land Commission Rent Reductions during 1906–7, *Apr. 23,* 1574.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D.—*cont.*
Macroom
Petty Sessions—Chairmanship of M. O'Hara, *Apr. 18,* 1112.
Warrant Issued by Mr. O'Hara in connection with Ballingeary Disturbance, *Apr. 22,* 1386.
Orpen Estate—Provision of Farm for T. Griffin, *Apr. 17,* 1002.

Sheffield, Sir B. [Yorkshire, W.R., Osgoldcross]
Athenry—Outrage at Houses of Tierney and Mrs. Raftery, *Apr. 23,* 1573.
Ballinageeragh Disturbance—Persons Proceeded against, *Apr. 23,* 1574.
"Dreadnought" Supply of Ammunition to, *Apr. 18,* 1131.
Woolwich Arsenal—Boxes of Ammunition awaiting Repair, *Apr. 18,* 1114.

Shettleston
Free Church Property, Allocation of.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 18,* 1122.

Shop Clubs Act (1902) Amendment Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 17,* 1008.

Shop Hours Act
Orders made under, Presented, *Apr. 11,* 331; *Apr. 15,* 567; *Apr. 22,* 1343, 1371.

Siam
Concessions to France—Effect of Treaty on British Interests.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16,* 764.
Vice-Consulate Buildings in, Inadequate Accommodation Provided, alleged.
Os. Mr. A. Bryce, *Apr. 8,* 34, 35, Mr. Harcourt, 37.

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Ltd., Bill
l. 2R.* *Apr. 17,* 921.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Annan River, Salmon Fishery Rights in—Case of T. Murray, *Apr. 11,* 274.
Beauly and Ness Rivers, Fishery Rights Claimed in, *Apr. 22,* 1420.
Churches Commission, Functions of, *Apr. 12,* 498.
Clyde Fisheries—Herrings Landed in 1906, *Apr. 19,* 1262.
Deer Forests, Proposals for Restricting Extension of, *Apr. 22,* 1421.
Dumbarton Sewerage, Proposals for Improving, *Apr. 18,* 1165.

[*cont,*

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Edinburgh Grassmarket, Legality of Proposals to hold Sheep Market in, *Apr. 22*, 1422.
- Education
  - Consolidation of Statutes, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1422.
  - Grants and Cost, *Apr. 12*, 497.
  - Senior Students Training and General Education of, *Apr. 11*, 374.
- Elliot Junction Railway Accident—Decision as to Remission of Sentence on Gourlay, *Apr. 11*, 375.
- Fisheries—"Campania," Damage done to Nets by, *Apr. 22*, 1420.
- Greenock—Prison Governorships, Qualifications of Warder Promoted to, *Apr. 11*, 373.
- Kilmarnock Court House, Grant for Improving, *Apr. 11*, 338.
- Kilsyth Established Church Manse Repairs, Assessment of Dissenters for, *Apr. 17*, 954.
- Meat Inspection Inquiry by Dr. Dittmar, Information as to, *Apr. 15*, 614; *Apr. 22*, 1379.
- Moray Firth, Trawling in
  - British Subjects in Foreign Vessels, Prosecution of, *Apr. 18*, 1161.
  - Foreign Vessels reported and prosecuted, *Apr. 15*, 615, 616.
  - "Lucania," Case, *Apr. 15*, 616.
- Paisley Magistrates' Order as to Alterations to Licensed House—Identity of Workmen, *Apr. 15*, 615; *Apr. 22*, 1421.
- Police
  - Services, Grants for, *Apr. 12*, 498.
  - Statistics for Scotland, *Apr. 16*, 747.
- Population in 1841 and 1906, *Apr. 16*, 738.
- Port William Church Property, Allocation of, *Apr. 22*, 1423.
- Rights of Way, Public, Proposals for Protection of, *Apr.* 22, 1422.
- Shettleston Free Church Property, Allocation of, *Apr. 18*, 1122.
- Whaling Stations in Scotland, *Apr. 16*, 773.

Slate Quarries
- Fatalities in—Information given in Report (1905).
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 768, 769.

Slaughtering of Animals
- *See* Cattle—Slaughtering.

Sligo
- Land Commission Cases dealt with on 18th March.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1107.

Sligo—*cont.*
- Land Purchase Arrears, Amount deducted for.
  - *Q.* Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1389, 1390.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
- Belfast
  - Constabulary Medical Attendants, Number of, etc., *Apr. 17*, 1004.
  - Post Office Telegraph Messengers, Sunday Duty and Pay of, *Apr. 18*, 1108.
- Constabulary
  - Barracks, Sanitary Accommodation in, *Apr. 18*, 1127.
  - Cadets, Examinations for, *Apr. 18*, 1127.
  - Reserve Force at Depot, Pay of, *Apr. 17*, 1005.
- Doohooma School Teacher—Case of Mr. Cryan, *Apr. 17*, 1002.
- Draperstown Sewer Obstruction, Proposals for Removing, *Apr. 11*, 344.
- Irish Administration, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 344.
- Jamaica Banana Trade—Effect of Subsidy, *Apr. 19*, 1261.
- Kilmorey Estate, Sale of—Amount of Negotiation Fee, *Apr. 11*, 344.
- London County Council (General Powers), Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15*, 692.
- Lough Cutra School—Hour of Attendance of Protestant Children, *Apr. 19*, 1266.
- Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for, *Apr. 11*, 343.
- Schools under Protestant Management—Rule as to Appointment of Assistant Teacher, *Apr. 17*, 996, 997.

Small Holdings Bill
- Date of Introducing.
  - *Q.* Mr. Brodie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 348.

Small Holdings (No. 3) Bill
- c. 1R.* *Apr. 11*, 393.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
- Second Reading, Date of Taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11*, 382.
  - *Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 23*, 1578.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
- Bannockburn Field, Bore Stone, Steps taken for Preservation of, *Apr. 8*, 22.
- Greenock—Prison Governorships, Qualifications of Warder Promoted to, *Apr. 11*, 373.
- Indian Legislative Councils, Discussion of Report on, *Apr. 11*, 211.

[*cont.*

Smeaton, Mr. D. M.—*cont.*
- Kilsyth Established Church Manse Repairs, Assessment of Dissenters for, *Apr. 17*, 953.
- Lords of Committee of Privy Council, Meetings of, *Apr. 11*, 380.
- Scottish Committees, Proposals as to—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *Apr. 15*, 654.

Smith, Mr. A. H. [Herts., Hertford]
- Athenry Disturbance on 7th inst.—Arrests made and Measures taken to Preserve Peace, *Apr. 22*, 1400.
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committees—Classes of Bills to be Referred to, Principle of Selection, *Apr. 15*, 717.
- Dublin Postal Telegraph Service—Supply of Messengers, *Apr. 22*, 1400.
- Parliamentary Reform proposals
  - Amendments, Attitude of the Government towards, *Apr. 15*, 641.
  - Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 641.
- Postal Officials in Ireland, Assaults on—Measures for Police Protection, etc., *Apr. 22*, 1399.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
- Admiralty, Administrative Policy of, Charges of Secrecy, *Apr. 17*, 1075–1085.
- Navy
  - Foreign Cruiser Programme, *Apr. 17*, 1080.
  - Nore Fleet, Efficiency of Crews, Training proposals, etc., *Apr. 17*, 1079.
  - Relative Strength in Battleships of Great Britain and Foreign Powers, *Apr. 17*, 1078.
  - "Truth about the Navy," Circulation to Crews at the Public Expense, *Apr. 17*, 1085.
  - Two-power Standard, Necessity for Maintaining, *Apr. 17*, 1076–1078.
- Private Property at Sea, Immunity of—Proposals for Bringing before the Hague Conference, *Apr. 17*. 1080.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. Strand, Westminster]
- London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1513–1515.

Smyth, Mr. T. [Leitrim, S.]
- Albemarle Estate—Reinstatement Claim of O. Scollan, *Apr. 16*, 777; *Apr. 23*, 1576.
- Allen Estate—Reinstatement Claim of P. Woods, *Apr. 19*, 1264.
- Forbes Estate Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement Claims of, *Apr. 16*, 777.
- O'Rourke Estate, Sale Proposals for—Inclusion of Turbary, etc., *Apr. 17*, 999.
- White Estate — Reinstatement Claim of F. McNally, *Apr. 16*, 777.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
- Inland Revenue Supervisors—Examinations since 1897, *Apr. 18*, 1163.

Society of Apothecaries of London Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 734.

Solicitor General
- *Sir W. S. Robson.*

Solicitor General for Ireland
- *Mr. R. Barry.*

Solicitor General for Scotland
- *Mr. A. Ure.*

Soudan
- Bahr-el-Ghazal, Cause for Occupation by Congolese Troops.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 11*, 213.
- Finances, Administration and Conditions—Report (1906) Presented, *Apr. 8*, 3; *Apr. 15*, 563.
- Khartoum Natives, Application of, for Establishment of Girls' Schools.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 763, 964.
- Land Acquired by Government—Price Paid, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 16*, 763. 764.
- Trade Report, Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

South African War
- Auxiliary Forces, Service of—Strength Enrolled, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fiennes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1378.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Bill
- *c.* *Rep.** *Apr. 18*, 1102.
- 3R.* *Apr. 23*, 1543.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill
- *c.* *Rep.** *Apr. 11*, 329.
- *Con.** *Apr. 16*, 733.
- 3R.* *Apr. 19*, 1257.
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 22*, 1341.

Southampton
- Inland Revenue Offices at, Increase in Estimate for.
  - *Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 42.
- Telephone Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Lieut.-Colonel Philipps; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 22*, 1394.

Spain
- Embassy House at Madrid, Estimate for Acquisition and Alterations to.
  - *Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 30, 33; Mr. Morton, 30; Mr. Harcourt, 31.

Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Rulings of
Anticipating Discussion on an Amendment was not in Order, *Apr. 11*, 410, 466.
Matter Irrelevant to Subject under Discussion, *Apr. 11*, 468; *Apr. 15*, 642, 644, 663, 673, 699, 702; *Apr. 16*, 793, 794, 796.
Member for Denbigh, Allegations as to Votes Given by, in Support of the Government, *Apr. 11*, 389, 390.
Patents and Designs Bill
Instructions to Committee, *Apr. 17*, 1054–1056.
Responsibility for Advancing Discussion by One Day, *Apr. 17*, 1012.
Reflections on future Chairmen of Committees were out of Order, *Apr. 11*, 406.
Reflections on Veracity of Member was not in Order, *Apr. 19*, 1282.
Standing Committees, Effect of New Rules on Existing Standing Committees, *Apr. 15*, 727, 728; *Apr. 16*, 779, 780.

Spicer, Sir A. [Hackney, Central]
Census of Production Act—Formation of Advisory Committees, *Apr. 18*, 1121.
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1515, 1516.
London Unemployed—Statistics as to Help Given Out of Grant, etc., *Apr. 8*, 7.

Spirits
Colonial Imported Spirit for Methylating, Duty on.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1143.
Excise Duties on, Continuance of.
Resolution (Mr. Asquith) *Apr. 18*, 1255.

Spotted Fever
See Cerebro-Spinal Meningitis.

Spurious Sports Bill
Facilities for Passing in Order to Prevent Cruelty in Deer Hunting, proposed.
Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 16*, 754.

Standing Committees
See under Committees.

Standing Orders
No. 18, Amendment of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1170.
No. 47—Facilities for Discussion of, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *Apr. 15*, 665.
No. 128—Alteration of to Allow Payment of Interest out of Capital by Railways During Construction.
Os. Earl of Onslow *Apr. 16*, 730, 731.

Stanger, Mr. H. Y. [Kensington, N.]
Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, Proposals as to, *Apr. 15*, 613.

Starkey, Mr. J. R. [Notts., Newark]
Whaling Stations in Scotland, *Apr. 16*, 773.

Stationery Office
Warehouse, Cost of Erection
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 8*, 53; Mr. Harcourt, 55.

Statute Law Revision Bill
l. 2R., *Apr. 23*, 1534.

Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 734.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Finsbury, C.]
Telegraph Service—Conditions of Employment of ex-Soldiers, *Apr. 11*, 337.

Stepney
Poor Law Officials, Treatment of Mrs. Baker (or Lewis) by.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 16*, 771.

Stocks and Shares
Depreciation of, Causes of.
Os. Mr. G. Faber, *Apr. 18*, 1220–1222; Sir T. P. Whittaker, 1476, 1477.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
Agricultural Holdings Act—Protection of Farmers against Sporting Landlords, *Apr. 17*, 950.
Anthrax Outbreaks—Measures taken to Ascertain Source of Infection, *Apr. 18*, 1164.
Bath Butter Adulteration Case—Percentage of Moisture shewn in Butter by Analysis, *Apr. 11*, 373.
Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17* 1056–1062.
Gooseberry Mildew, Proposals for Preventing Spread of, *Apr. 17*, 952.
Horses, Worn-out—Proposals for Regulating Conditions of Transport to Continent, *Apr. 18*, 1164.
Lune Fishery Board—Reason for refusing Licence to Ingleton Angling Association, *Apr. 9*, 82.
Molascuit, Advantages of, *Apr. 10*, 218.
Tuberculosis, Bovine—Compulsory Notification of Disease in Cows, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 950.

Straits Settlements
Anti-Opium Societies, Resolutions passed at Meeting of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18*, 1133, 1134.

[*cont.*

Straits Settlements—*cont.*
Penang Protector of Chinese, Effect of Proclamation on Opium, issued by.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18,* 1134.

Strokestown Union
Labourers' Cottages, Site Selected for
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 17,* 999.

Stuart Papers
Calendar—Copy Presented, *Apr. 8,* 4; *Apr. 15,* 563.

Sugar
Duty
Revenue derived from and Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1194; Mr. Scott, 1239, 1240; Mr. Maddison, 1244; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1252; Mr. Morton, 1253; Sir C. Dilke, *Apr. 22,* 1462; Mr. S. Wortley, 1468.
Yield from in 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1178.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
Agricultural Holdings Act—Protection of Farmers against Sporting Landlords, *Apr. 17,* 950.
Hartlepool—Rifle Corps of Galleys Field Upper Standard School, *Apr. 23,* 1569.
Moray Firth, Trawling in—Prosecution of British Subjects in Foreign Vessels, *Apr. 18,* 1165.
Post Office Arrangements with Tramway—Undertakings for Conveyance of Mails, etc., *Apr. 16,* 772.
Shardlow Union—Fee Charged for Death Certificates, *Apr. 16,* 771.
Stepney Poor Law Officials, Treatment of Mrs. Baker (or Lewis) by, *Apr. 16,* 771.
Thornley and Sunderland Postmen, Hours of Duty of, *Apr. 16,* 743.
Trinidad
Local Customs Tariff Inquiry—Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 11,* 355.
Petition as to Port of Spain Borough Council, *Apr. 23,* 1562.

Sunderland
Customs Building at, Increase in Estimate for.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8,* 42; Mr. Harcourt, 43.
Postmen to Cleadon, Hours of Duty of.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Buxton *Apr. 16,* 743.

Superannuation
Kew Gardens, Assistant to Director of—Removal of Office from Operation of Act, *Apr. 15,* 567.
Pensions, Inclusion of Army or Navy Service in Calculating, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 11,* 334.
System of Calculating Pensions
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 11,* 347.

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill
l. Rep. Apr. 23,* 1533.

Sweated Industries Bill
c. 2R., *Apr. 12,* 559.

Sweden and Norway
New Treaty, Progress of Negotiations as to.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 11,* 361 362.

Taff Vale Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 10* 193.
Rep. Apr. 17,* 937.
Con. Apr. 23,* 1543.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
Schools, New—Legislative Proposals for authorising Erection, *Apr. 18,* 1159.

Taxation
Direct and Indirect Percentages (1906–7 and 1907–8).
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 23,* 1547, 1548.
Income Tax, *see that title.*
Indirect, Absence of Remission of, from Budget Proposals.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22,* 1437, 1438; Mr. McKenna, 1458; Sir C. Dilke, 1467, 1468; Mr. E. Cecil, 1482.
Ireland
Contribution by, in 1801–2.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 19,* 1263.
Rateable Valuation and Collection of Income-tax per head.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 17,* 942.
Revenue Collected in (1890, 1895, 1900, and 1905).
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 16,* 743.
Local
Account—Exchequer Payments to during 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18,* 1180.
Resolution (Mr. Runciman), *Apr. 22,* 1532.

[*cont.*

Taxation—*cont.*
Local—*cont.*
Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1195–1198; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1213; Mr. V. Cavendish, 1234; Col. R. Williams, 1237; Mr. T. R. Macdonald, 1249; Sir C. Dilke, *Apr. 22*, 1462.

Revenue derived from in 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1180.

War Taxes, Possibility of remitting.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1193; *Apr. 22*, 1484.

Taximeter Cabs
See under Cabs

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Bills, referring to Standing Committees—Exemption of Bills affecting Constitution of Colonies, or Naval and Military questions, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 823.

olitical Party favouring Shipping Subsidies, Legality of Subscription by Shipping Company to, *Apr. 15*, 600.

Prescot Land Tax Commissioners, Procedure in Appointing, *Apr. 18*, 1162.

Tea
Duty on
Continuance of at 5d. in the Pound.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1194; Mr. Rees, 1226, 1227; Mr. C. E. Price, 1236; Mr. Rawlinson, 1248, 1249.

Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 18*, 1211.

Revenue derived from, in 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1178.

Teddington
Rates, System of Collecting.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 22*, 1413.

Tees Conservancy Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 16*, 729.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 17*, 938.

Telegraph Service
[*See also* names of places.]
Colour of Envelopes of Telegrams, Alteration in, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1120, 1121.

Conditions of Service of Staff, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 22*, 1415.

Telegraph Service—*cont.*
Ex-soldiers, Conditions of employing and Wages paid to.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 11*, 337.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 17*, 943, 945.

Temporary Assistants, Conditions of employing.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 12*, 496.

Typewriting of Telegrams, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 18*, 1120.

Telephone Service
[*See also* names of places.]
Male Clerical Staff, Decision as to placing on Establishment.
Q. Sir J. Baker; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 10*, 201, 202.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
c. 2R., *Apr. 9*, 83; *Apr. 10*, 232; *Apr. 23*, 1584.

County Associations, Provisions as to Forming.
Q. Captain Hervey; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1116.

Debates on Second Reading [Commons], *Apr. 9*, 83; *Apr. 10*, 232; *Apr. 23*, 1584.

Army Council, Powers of, 86.

Artillery
Importance of, Necessity for adequate Training of Drivers, etc., *Apr. 23*, 1633–1637.

Reduction, Proposals as to, 1629.

Territorial, Proposals as to, 119, 178–183, 279, 280, 1672, 1673, 1682, 1683.

Cadet Corps, Proposals as to, 268, 1591, 1600, 1613, 1614, 1663–1665.

Colonial Contributions towards Imperial Defence, 1589.

Committee, Proposals for Discussion in 1685, 1686.

Compulsory Military Service Question as to, 186, 187, 285, 1594, 1616, 1617, 1643, 1647, 1648; 1651, 1653–1655, 1657, 1658, 1679.

Cost of the Scheme, 111–121, 130, 137, 138, 143, 162, 163, 188, 275, 277, 1623, 1637.

County Associations, Establishment of, 123, 124, 125, 136, 149, 164, 261, 276, 277, 1597, 1598, 1613, 1619, 1622, 1623–1625.

Accounts of, Provisions as to Auditing, etc., 278, 279, 1592.

Duties and Powers of, 149, 174, 175.

Expenses of, Proposals as to Meeting, 277, 278.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates on Second Reading—cont.*
  - Expansion in time of War, Provision for, 104, 154, 155, 1621, 1643.
  - First Line or Expeditionary Foreign Force, Proposals as to, 84, 86, 89, 100, 111–114, 235, 256, 290, 1628, 1629.
    - Number of, Reason for fixing at 167,000, 140, 163, 251, 274, 1585–1588.
  - Home or Territorial Force to absorb and replace the Auxiliary Forces, Proposals as to 85, 87–89, 93, 94, 97, 124, 128, 131–135, 140, 152, 156, 161–163, 166, 171, 173, 178, 184, 185, 258–260, 263–266, 274, 275, 282–284, 287, 288, 291–294, 1604–1611, 1618–1620, 1622-1628, 1643–1647, 1665–1668.
    - Army Council, Representation on, Decision as to, 121, 125.
    - County Associations, *see that sub-heading.*
    - Foreign Service in cases of National Emergency Proposals as to, 85, 1606, 1607, 1613, 1640–1642.
    - Kit, Allowances for, 118, 162.
    - Pay and Allowances for, 120, 156, 157, 253, 288, 1608, 1680, 1681, 1682.
    - Terms of Service, 95, 167, 168, 1639, 1640.
    - Training, Proposals as to, 92, 93, 94, 124, 150, 168, 169, 170, 244, 245, 261, 273, 274, 1625–1627, 1652.
  - India, Troops required for, 1585–1588.
  - Industrial Relations between Employer and Employed, Alleged Interference with, 1590, 1591, 1600, 1601.
  - Legal Proceedings, Ambiguity of Clauses dealing with, 136, 137, 175, 254.
  - Legislation by Regulation, alleged, 85.
  - Memorandum, Terms of, 83 84, 116, 117, 237.
  - Military Training in Schools, etc., Objections to, 1590, 1591, 1600, 1613, 1614, 1659, 1666.
  - Militia, Objections to abolishing, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 101, 102, 106, 144, 152, 153, 164, 170, 1631, 1632, 1674.
    - Ballot Act, Proposals as to Repeal of, etc., 177, 178.
    - Irish Militia, Proposals as to, 1678.
    - New Organisation of, 1674.
  - Officers
    - Promotion from the Ranks, proposed, 269–271, 1590, 1616.
    - Reserve of, Proposals as to, 257.
    - Shortage in Supply of, 150, 241, 270, 1604, 1684.
    - Universities and Public Schools as a Source of Supply, proposals as to, 241, 242, 268, 269, 1598, 1599, 1684.
  - Persons responsible for the Scheme, 133.
  - Recruits, Effect of New Scheme on Supply of, 93, 288, 1611, 1612.
  - Reserve
    - Reduction of, Proposals for, 91, 238, 1630.
    - Return as to, Misleading Character of, alleged, 237, 1682.
  - Special Contingent to provide Drafts for Active Service, 101–103, 135, 153, 154, 165, 249, 250, 281, 290, 1669, 1676, 1677.
  - Volunteers
    - Adjutants, Position of, under the New Scheme, 116, 117, 252, 289, 292, 1612.
    - Conditions to be imposed on, under the New Scheme, 94, 107, 126, 131–135, 150, 151, 174–176, 243, 254, 291–294, 1595, 1596, 1611–1613, 1615, 1625–1628, 1639, 1683.
    - Financial Liabilities, Proposals as to Transferring to the War Office, 138.
    - Property, etc., belonging to, Proposals as to Transferring to the War Office, 138, 139.
  - Yeomanry, Conditions to be imposed on under the New Scheme, 148, 150, 151, 158–161, 285–287, 1605–1611, 1637, 1638, 1651, 1678–1680.
- Enactments affected by—Memorandum Presented, *Apr. 15,* 565.
- Enlistment and Discharge, Provisions as to.
  - *Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17,* 971.
- Financial Adviser and Staff for Expeditionary Forces, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22,* 1408.
- Memorandum Presented, *Apr. 8,* 4; *Apr. 15,* 565, 566.
- Militia and Volunteer Officers, Effect on.
  - *Q.* Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 10,* 210, 211.
- Proposals as to consideration by New Standing Committee.
  - *Q.* Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22,* 1403.

Thames
Conservators—Report (1906) Presented, *Apr. 23*, 1534, 1545.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Bills relating to Wales and Monmouthshire, Constitution of Committees Dealing with, *Apr. 11*, 331.
Elementary Schools, Information as to, *Apr. 15*, 610, 611.
Welsh Church Commission—Resignation of certain Members, *Apr. 18*, 1169.

Thomas, Sir A. [Glamorganshire, E.]
Quarries—System of Appointing Managers, *Apr. 23*, 1564.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Telegraph Temporary Assistants, Conditions of Employing, *Apr. 12*, 496.

Thornley
Postman, Hours of Duty of.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 16*, 743.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
Civil Service—Pay of Women Typists, *Apr. 22*, 1419.
Customs and Excise
Senior Assistant Clerks, Promotion of, *Apr. 11*, 336.
Statistical Department New Class Clerks, Petition from, *Apr. 11*, 335.

Tobacco
Duties
Continuance of
Resolution (Mr. Asquith), *Apr. 18*, 1255.
Incidence of Charges.
Qs. Mr. D. MacIver; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1143, 1144.
Revenue derived from, in 1906–7.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1178.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
Ecclesiastical Commission, Grants by, out of City Church Fund (1906), *Apr. 23*, 1571.

Tottenham Estate
Reinstatement Claim of F. McGuinness.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 18*, 1126.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
Local Authorities, Powers as to Purchase and Holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 294–301.

Town Tenants (England and Wales) Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 18*, 1174.

Trade, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. H. E. Kearley.

Trade Reports
Annual Series, Presented, *Apr. 8*, 3; *Apr. 10*, 194; *Apr. 12*, 495; *Apr. 15*, 563; *Apr. 17*, 923, 938; *Apr. 23*, 1534, 1545.
Miscellaneous Series, Presented, *Apr. 8*, 3; *Apr. 15*, 563.

Trade and Commerce
Condition of.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 18*, 1175; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1215; Col. R. Williams, 1236, 1237; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *Apr. 22*, 1437.
Inter-Imperial Trade Statistics—Return Ordered, *Apr. 18*, 1105.

Tramways
Electric, Prevention of Accidents on—Inquiry into Brake Systems, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 11*, 368.
Street and Road, Information as to—Return Ordered, *Apr. 17*, 939.

Transvaal
Chinese Labourers
Morality, Proposals as to, Further Reports on.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 15*, 572.
Repatriation out of Imperial Funds, Proposals for Continuing.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 18*, 1134.
Mortality during Voyage.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 9*, 80.

Trawling
See under Fisheries.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Runciman.

Treasury Bills
Amounts Outstanding (1896–1907).
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 17*, 944.

Treaties
Colonial Accessions to, Presented, *Apr. 15*, 562.
Most-Favoured-Nation Clauses in Existing Treaties—Return, Presented, *Apr. 8*, 3; *Apr. 15*, 564.
National Treatment Clauses in Existing Treaties—Return Presented, *Apr. 8*, 4; *Apr. 15*, 564.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
- Hexham Parliamentary Election, Cause for Postponement of, *Apr. 11*, 383.
- London, City of—Committee Allowance for Lunch—Inquiry into Expenditure of Fund known as City Cash, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 7.
- London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1520, 1521.
- London Municipal Society, Legality of Dock and Railway Companies Subscribing to, *Apr. 15*, 599 ; *Apr. 18*, 1148.

Trinidad
- Local Customs Tariff Inquiry—Constitution of Committee.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 11*, 355.
- Panama Canal, Labour for, *see* Panama Canal.
- Port-of-Spain Borough Council—Petition for Restoration of Elective Principle.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 23*, 1562.

Trust Investment Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 11*, 394.

Trustee Savings Banks
- Deposits and Withdrawals, Comparison of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Remnant ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 11*, 338.

Tuberculosis
- Bovine—Compulsory Notification of Disease in Cows, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. H. Marks ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 17*, 950.

Turkey
- Customs Increase, Assent of Great Britain to.
  - *Q.* Capt. Craig ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 15*, 595.
- Trade Reports, Presented, *Apr. 23*, 1524.

Turnour, Lord [Sussex, Horsham]
- Africa, East
  - Nairobi Magistrates, Powers of, to Punish Natives for Insulting White Women, *Apr. 15*, 594.
  - Number of White Troops in, *Apr. 16*, 762.
- Bills, Referring to Standing Committee
  - Bills to Create Subordinate Legislature, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 785, 786.
  - Powers of the Crown, or either House of Parliament, Bills Modifying or Taking Away to be Exempted, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 459.
- Germany—British Stevedores Employed at Hamburg since 1st March, *Apr. 17*, 979.

Turnour, Lord—*cont.*
- House of Lords, Date of Proceeding with proposals as to, *Apr. 10*, 232.
- Houses of Parliament, Relations between, Proposals for Readjustment, *Apr. 18*, 1172.
- Navy
  - Foreign Countries, Shipbuilding Programmes of, *Apr. 17*, 973.
  - Ships, Means of Calculating Weight of Metal on, *Apr. 22*, 1382.
- Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1025–1027.
- Royston—Case of Mr. O. B. Milne, *Apr. 10*, 217 ; *Apr. 15*, 611, 612.

Tweedmouth, Lord — *First Lord of the Admiralty*
- Administrative Policy, *Apr. 17*, 930.
- "Dreadnought," Type of Battleship, Advantages and Disadvantages of, *Apr. 17*, 932.
- Estimates, Alteration in Method of Voting, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 933.
- Merchant Cruisers, Value of, as Auxiliaries in Time of War—Policy of Subsidising, *Apr. 17*, 933.
- Shipbuilding Programme, 1907–8, *Apr. 17*, 931–933.

Tyne Improvement Bill
- *l* 3R.* *Apr. 17*, 921.
- *c.* 1R.* *Apr. 22*, 1369.

Tyne River
- Police Force—Correspondence relative to refusal of Secretary of State's Certificate, Presented, *Apr. 19*, 1258 ; *Apr. 22*, 1343.

Uganda
- Railway—Cost of Construction
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 9*, 77.

Unemployed Workmen Act
- Failure of, Allegations as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Grady ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 17*, 949, 950.

United States
- Liquor Traffic Legislation—Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.
- Pittsburg—British Representation at Opening of Carnegie Institute.
  - *Os.* Lord Leith of Fyvie, *Apr. 22*, 1364 ; Lord Fitzmaurice, 1366.
  - *Qs.* Captain Craig, Mr. Lea ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 22*, 1411, 1412.

Vaccination
Exemption Certificates
Green, E. J., Case of.
Q. Mr. G. Clarke; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 8*, 16.
Hayles, R., Case of.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 18*, 1123.
Hill, C., Case of.
Q. Mr. Montgomery; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 15*, 575.
Moore, A. H., Case of.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 768.
Hunt, Olive, Cause of Death of—Report of Dr. Fletcher.
Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 18*, 1158.
Legislative Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 768.
Primary—Instruction as to Size of Vesicle.
Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Burns *Apr. 15*, 603, 604.
Public Vaccinators, Remuneration of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 17*, 950.
Workhouses, Cost in.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 15*, 603.

Valentia, Viscount
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill. 2R. *Apr. 9*, 158–161.

Venezuela
Ciudad Bolivar—Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 15*, 563.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 15*, 691.

Victoria and Albert Museum
Post Office Opposite to, Condition of
Qs. Sir W. Evans-Gordon, Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 8*, 48.

Vincent, Colonel Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield Central]
Colonel Conference—Facilities for Premiers to see Volunteers and Yeomanry Forces, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1114.
Horses, Worn-out—Proposals for Regulating Conditions of Transport to Continent, *Apr. 18*, 1164.
Immigrants, Poll Tax on, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 976.
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1053.
Siamese Concessions to France—Effect of Treaty on British Interests, *Apr. 16*, 764.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 130–139; *Apr. 10*, 252, 255.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
Birkenhead Post Office Medical Officer, *Apr. 22*, 1377.
Companies, Limited, Number Registered in 1906, Amount of Share Capital, etc. *Apr. 11*, 368.

Volunteers
Brigade-Majors, Expenses of—Consideration of Report and Decision as to Increase of Pay.
Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11*, 351.
Buildings, Drill Halls, etc., Value of—Amount Paid off, etc.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 15*, 578, 589.
Financial Liabilities, Transfer of
Consent of Volunteer Corps.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 15*, 578.
Position of Commanding Officers on Disbandment or Transfer of Corps.
Q. Sir J. Brunner; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1405.
Lulworth Camp—Refusal of Permission to Young Men's Christian Association to Erect Recreation Tent.
Q. Mr. Partington; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1393.

Wages
Receipts for Sums over £2, Liability of to Stamp Duty.
Q. Mr. Wilkie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 23*, 1568.

Walker, Mr. H. De R. [Leicestershire, Melton]
Naval Cadets, Cost of Educating, *Apr. 23*, 1558.

Walrond, Mr. L. [Devonshire, Tiverton]
Local Authorities, Expenditure of and Number of Persons employed by, *Apr. 18*, 1157.

Walsh, Mr. S. [Lancashire, S.W., Ince]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 501–508, 517, 520, 538.
Referring to Standing Committees on Trade, proposed, *Apr. 12*, 551.

Walters, Mr. J. T. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Local Authorities, Powers as to purchase and holding of Land, Extension of, proposed, *Apr. 10*, 301–306.

Walton, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley]
Coal Miners (Eight Hours) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 12*, 531–534.

Walton, Sir J. L.—*Attorney-General* [Leeds, S.]
Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, Intro., *Apr. 17*, 1008–1011.
Proposals as to, *Apr. 15*, 613.

War Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Under-Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
Financial Secretary—Mr. R. Buchanan.
Canned Foodstuffs, *see that title.*
Clerical Staff, Leave and Allowances granted to.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17*, 962.
Contracts
Allocation to Ireland—Return as to Value, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 12*, 501.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Apr. 23*, 1557, 1558.
Meat Contracts allocated to Armour & Co.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17*, 962.
Military Employees, Pension Claims of.
Qs. Mr. Lea ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1404, 1405.
Pall Mall Buildings, Expenditure on Redecorating.
Q. Sir F. Banbury ; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 18*, 1161.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
Buildings, Public, Erection of, Criticisms on Policy as to and Estimates for, *Apr. 8*, 44.
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, Vote for—Acquisition of Sites and Buildings and Works in connection therewith, Explanation of Items, *Apr. 8*, 36.
Ladybower—School Facilities for Children of Navvies, *Apr. 17*, 980, 981.
Magistrates—Adjudications by Justices and Stipendiary Magistrates, *Apr. 16*, 768.
Parliament, Houses of—Accounts, Separation of, proposed, *Apr. 8*, 71.
Prison Warders Grievances of—Proposals for dealing with matter, *Apr. 11*, 365.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 266–273.

Wardle, Mr. G. J. [Stockport]
Newton Heath Railway Accident—Proposals for Inquiry, *Apr. 11*, 368.

Waring, Captain W. [Banffshire]
Death Duties claimed when not Exigible, Reimbursement of Expense incurred in resisting, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 597.

Warner, Mr. S. C. T. [Staffordshire, Lichfield]
Army Reserve Officers—Eligibility of Militia Officers under new Scheme, *Apr. 22*, 1392.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 10*, 273–276.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Africa, East
Nairobi Magistrates, Powers of, to Punish Natives for Insulting White Women, *Apr. 15*, 593.
Police Force, Information as to, *Apr. 16*, 761.
Colonies, Employment of Coloured Policemen, in, *Apr. 17*, 975.
Fisheries—Damage done to Nets by Norwegian Trawler "Campania," *Apr. 22*, 1419.
Telegraph Staff, Conditions of Service of, *Apr. 22*, 1415.

Waterford
Postal Despatch for London, Route for.
Q. Mr. Power ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 23*, 1553, 1554.

Waterlow, Mr. D. S. [Islington, N.]
Alexandra Park Betting Case, Decision in, *Apr. 17*, 976.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
Canned Foodstuffs—Report of Lieut.-Col. Hobbes on Chicago Packing Establishments, *Apr. 11*, 352.
Court of Extractor's Department, Application of Session Clerks Act to, *Apr. 17*, 953.
Greenock, Prison Governorship, Qualifications of Warder promoted to, *Apr. 11*, 373.
House of Commons—Improvement of Newspaper-room proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1383.
Meat Inspection Inquiry by Dr. Dittmar, Information as to, *Apr. 15*, 614 ; *Apr. 22*, 1378, 1379.
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, Proposals as to, *Apr. 15*, 601.
Scottish Marriage Laws, Revision of, proposed, *Apr. 17*, 952.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
Lead Poisoning, Medical Examination for Discovering—Letter from Dr. Shufflebotham, *Apr. 23*, 1566.
Nigeria, Northern, Railway Construction in, *Apr. 17*, 974.
Youthful Offenders Bill, Facilities for, *Apr. 23*, 1564.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Beauly and Ness Rivers, Fishery Rights claimed in, *Apr. 22*, 1420.
Coigach Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 609.
Indian Railways—Decision as to Vizanigan-Malia Route, *Apr. 18*, 1124.
London Brighton and South Coast Trains, Lighting of, *Apr. 15*, 601.
Teddington Rate-Collection System, *Apr. 22*, 1413.

Welsh Church
Commission—Resignation of certain Members.
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1169.

West Ham
Poor Relief Statistics (1904–7).
Q. Mr. C. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 22*, 1395, 1396.

West Indies
[*See also* names of Islands.]
Local Correspondence, Arrangements for Conveying between the Islands.
Qs. Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 17*, 955; *Apr. 22*, 1409, 1410.
Silver Currency shipped to, Profit on.
Q. Mr. O. C. Philipps; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 8*, 10, 11.

West Riding Tramways Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 8*, 2.
*Rep.** *Apr. 17*, 1102.
*Con.** *Apr. 22*, 1369.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr. 8*, 2.

Westmeath
South, Parliamentary Election for—New Member sworn, *Apr. 19*, 1268.

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill.
l. 3R.* *Apr. 15*, 561.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 16*, 734.

Westropp Estate
Untenanted Land, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 22*, 1387.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Dumbarton Post Office, New, Site for, *Apr. 8*, 45.
Emigration—Scottish Statistics (1897–1906), *Apr. 17*, 977.
Patents and Designs Bill, 2R., *Apr. 17*, 1030–1035.

White Estate
Reinstatement Claim of F. McNally.
Q. Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 16*, 777.

Whitehall
New Government Offices, Departments to be accommodated in.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 23*, 1570.

Whittaker, Sir T. P. [Yorks, W.R., Spen Valley]
Death Duties, Revision of, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1476.

Whittaker, Sir T. P.—*cont.*
Income Tax
Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1472–1476.
Employers to give Particulars of Salaries, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1472, 1473.
Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *Apr. 22*, 1471.
National Debt, Reduction of, Provision for, *Apr. 22*, 1476.
Old-Age Pension Scheme of the Government, *Apr. 22*, 1477, 1478.
Securities, Depreciation of, *Apr. 22*, 1476, 1477.

Whyte Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 19*, 1264.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
London Port and Docks Bill, 2R., *Apr. 22*, 1510–1513.

Wilkie, Mr. A [Dundee]
Bakehouses, Underground, Ventilation and Inspection of, *Apr. 11*, 367.
Wages—Liability of Receipts for over £2 for Stamp Duty, *Apr. 23*, 1568.

Williams, Colonel R. [Dorset. W.]
Income-Tax on Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 18*, 1238, 1239.
Old-Age Pensions—Government Proposals for dealing with the Matter, *Apr. 18*, 1237.
South African War Debt, Position of, *Apr. 18*, 1238.
Taxation, Local—assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *Apr. 18*, 1237.
Trade and Commerce, Condition of, *Apr. 18*, 1236, 1237.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Bills, referring to Standing Committees—Bills to create subordinate Legislatures, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 795, 796.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 164–169.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorks, E.R., Holderness]
Magistrates, Political Opinions of—Proposals for Appointment of Liberals, *Apr. 17*, 1006.
Moray Firth, Trawling in
British Subjects in Foreign Vessels, Prosecution of, *Apr. 18*, 1165, 1167.
Legislation, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1433, 1434.
"Lucania," Case, etc., *Apr. 15*, 615, 616.
[*cont.*

Wilson, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Reform Proposals
Amendments, Attitude of Government towards, *Apr. 15*, 648, 649.
Termination of Proceedings—Closure of Debate, *Apr. 15*, 646–649.
Standing Committees
Effect of New Rules on Existing Standing Committees, *Apr. 15*, 728.
Report of Proceedings—Proposals for, *Apr. 18*, 1172, 1173.

Wiltshire
Charities—Return Presented, *Apr. 22*, 1371.

Windsor Park
Lawn Mowers, Estimate for Erection of Sheds for.
Qs. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 8*, 22, 23; Mr. Harcourt, 23.

Woodlands St. Mary
Post Office, Position of.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 15*, 608, 609.

Woolwich
Arsenal Discharges
Bonus, Regulations as to Payment of.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 16*, 757.
Discussion, Opportunity for.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 18*, 1171.
Emigration Leaflets distributed among Artisans.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 22*, 1409.
Inquiry and Discussion, Proposals for.
Qs. Mr. Rowlands, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 15*, 589, 590.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 15*, 625, 626.
Number employed (1884–1906).
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 17*, 967, 968.
Correction to Figures in Answer, *Apr. 19*, 1268,
Reason for and Proposals for Obviating.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 10*, 209, 210.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 11*, 351, 352.
Statistics as to Number during 1907.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 22*, 1402, 1403.
Boxes of Ammunition awaiting Repair.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 18*, 1114.
Poor Relief Statistics (1904–7).
Q. Mr. C. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 22*, 1395, 1396.

Workhouses
Dietary—Regulations as to Allowance of Bread.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 19*, 1262.
Milk Supply for Children, Regulations for ensuring Purity of.
Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 17*, 948.
Vaccination, *see that title.*

Wortley, Rt. Hon., C.B.S. [Sheffield, Hallam]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
Bills to create Subordinate Legislature, or to give Effect to Treaties, etc., or to sanction Cession of Territory, Exemption of, proposed, *Apr. 15*, 721–723.
Money Bills, Proposals as to, *Apr. 11*, 423.
Report Stage of Bills so committed, allowing same Right of Discussion as if it were before Committee of the House, proposed, *Apr. 16*, 846.
Income Tax
Earned Incomes of £2,000, Taxing at Rate of 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 22*, 1470.
Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *Apr. 22*, 1471.
Local Government Board Vote, Date of Taking, *Apr. 18*, 1170.
Old-Age Pensions, Scheme of the Government, *Apr. 22*, 1470.
Sugar Duty, Proposals as to, *Apr. 22*, 1468.

Wreckage
Finding of—Power of Tide Surveyor to take Timber from Salvors.
Q. Mr. W. Hope; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 18*, 1122.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]
Bills, Referring to Standing Committees
Amendments, Attitude of Government towards, *Apr. 11*, 483, 484.
Army, Navy or Reserve Forces, Exemption of Bills dealing with, proposed, *Apr. 11*, 483–486.
Law Land (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 18*, 1331.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 2R., *Apr. 9*, 83–98.

Yorkshire
Crime in, Proportion to Population, etc.
Qs. Mr. Mooney, Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. W. Redmond, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 16*, 769, 770.

Youthful Offenders Bill
Facilities for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 23*, 1564.

Zanzibar
Slavery on Coast Strip, Abolition of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 8*, 14.